

The Editors are happy to receive and to consider articles from any quarter; but they cannot in any case return MSS. which are not accepted; nor will they hold interviews or correspondence concerning them.

## THE ROUND TABLE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1868.

### PANSCANDINAVISM.

LIKE Panslavism in the north-east and south-west, Panscandinavism, its counterpart, is steadily gaining strength in the extreme north of Europe. Denmark, too feeble to preserve her territorial integrity and political independence by the side of the new North German Confederation, drifts inevitably into a union with consanguine Sweden and Norway. The consolidation of these three northern states is well understood to be earnestly favored by Louis Napoleon, who wishes to restore the balance of power in that part of the world by a Scandinavian empire. The treaty of Prague, though it left Prussia more formidable than before, nevertheless held out the promise of some compensating advantages in the severance of the federal tie, and in what seemed to guarantee a permanent division of the German nationality. A very brief time sufficed, however, to dispel these expectations. The rise of a powerful state in North Germany, which was regarded with jealousy and fear by the minor states of the South, and which was also thought to be hopelessly estranged from Austria, might not have been calculated to inspire uneasiness. But it was different when this alienation proved illusory and transient. Austria soon showed a disposition to forget the war of 1866, while the relations between the two sections not only became more friendly, but culminated in defensive and offensive alliances, which were followed by customs treaties, a customs Parliament, and other measures unmistakably national in character and aims.

The scheme of uniting Denmark with her sister states of the great northern peninsula is not a new one. It had already found adherents in the beginning of the last decade, after the conclusion of the Schleswig-Holstein insurrection of 1848, but it was not until last summer that it took its present tangible, authoritative form. On the 7th day of July, 1868, the Princess Louisa of Sweden, only child of Charles the Fifteenth, was solemnly betrothed to Frederick, the heir to the Danish crown, and from that date the Panscandinavian movement may be considered to have assumed a new phase. This family alliance, which had been the ardent wish of the Scandinavists on both sides of the Sund, was the work of the King of Sweden, himself a staunch supporter of Panscandinavian unity. The grandson of the founder of his house, he believes that the wisdom of his ancestors has seated the Bernadotte dynasty sufficiently firmly on the throne to enable him to reenact in a narrower sphere the rôle of Gustavus Adolphus in modern history. Charles the Fifteenth aspires, without the aid of a Cavour or a Bismarck, to become to the most northerly regions of Europe what Victor Emanuel has been to the southern and William the First to the central. When the obvious motives of the two northern sovereigns are considered, and it is remembered that the younger brother of King Charles, the Duke of East Gothland, is also an enthusiastic Scandinavist, we are justified in suspecting that this betrothal was not meant for the distant period when the young couple will reign over the three countries after the death of both royal fathers, but for an earlier day. In the meantime it seems, however, to have been deemed the more prudent course to say nothing about the object for which the family connection was formed, and to let it be inferred that no immediate results are expected to spring from it. Whatever plans may have been agreed on, they are carefully kept from public knowledge by the interested parties. Indeed, the semi-official Scandinavian organs (such as the *Fädrelandet*, *Dagbladet*, and others) take especial pains to declare that no closer union is contemplated at present, and deny most emphatically the existence of any fixed policy looking to a speedy realization of the Panscandinavian idea. *Qui s'excuse, s'accuse!*

But be this as it may—whether the projected Scandinavian hegemony is to be consummated a few years sooner or later, a definite understanding on the subject between the two northern courts and the Tuileries cannot be gainsaid. Russia, which will at all times and under all circumstances oppose the scheme, has already taken the alarm. She naturally prefers two weak states, whose territories are separated by the Sund, to a single strong state which holds both sides of the Sund, and which can bar to her ships the most easy and always accessible egress to sea. In addition to this, such a union would be very apt to strengthen at Stockholm the popularity of a policy resting on ancient traditions and living interests, a policy which has never yet completely reconciled itself to the loss of Finland, and which some day may be tempted to undo the work of centuries by remembering that even St. Petersburg stands on what was once Swedish soil. But we do not apprehend that Russia will prevail against France. The period when the Czar was entrusted with the preceptorship of Europe is past. Since three Olympiads the world has accustomed itself to make up its political balance-sheets without a Muscovite auditor. It was otherwise under Nicholas. Then eyes, ears, and thoughts turned unflinchingly to the north-east. The policy of cabinets and the ideas of subjects, publicism and diplomacy, gravitated toward the Winter Palace. The power of the Czar was ranked among the powers of nature. It was watched and studied. None dreamed of arresting or averting its course. The faithful trusted and adored it. The sceptics scoffed but submitted. There was no lack of prophets to proclaim the aurora borealis to be the true sun. More than one crowned head was content to be a Muscovite stipendiary. The Czar was popularly pictured chaining the imprisoned winds in the cave:

"celad sedet Æolus arcu  
Sceptra tenet, molliquit animos et temperat iræ."

The times have, however, changed. The altar of the northern deity was destroyed at Kalafat and Eupatoria, and his successor has degenerated into an ordinary mortal. Still, no Scandinavian statesman or ruler can think of Russia in connection with the future development of his country without feeling that she is a deadly foe. Not so with the North German Confederation, which needs not necessarily to be feared. To that power the question is not one of life or death, for it has a free North sea in addition to the East sea. Nor is there the remotest probability that Sweden will seek to revive her title to Pomerania, Mecklenburg, or Bremer-Verden—provinces now wholly Germanized—as long as the most inordinate lust of conquest has such a vast field as Russia to glut it.

How far the people of the three northern states, though all of the same race, sympathize with the ambitious views of their rulers, is not easy to say. In Sweden, which now enjoys a representative form of government, Panscandinavism appears to be more popular among the upper than the lower classes, though the liberal party is reported to have made it recently a part of its foreign programme. This information rather conflicts with what we know about the domestic situation of Sweden, which resembles in many respects that of Imperial France. There also the agricultural and industrial interests are engaged in a silent struggle with the reigning dynasty, the aristocracy, and the army. The increase of railway communication, so much needed in this sparsely-populated land, has of late given a strong impulse to progress, and deepened the repugnance of these classes to a military, adventurous policy. The feeling of kindred, which should lead the Swede to take an interest in the fortunes of his Danish neighbor, has little in common with the intensely national sympathies which have united Italy and will yet unite Germany. For the moment the inherited state of separation appears to suit the majority of the people; and, as nothing calls for a change which must involve more or less risk, the Swedes, if left to themselves, will not willingly draw the sword. The Norwegians, who espoused the cause of Denmark so warmly in 1864, have been estranged by the events which took place two years later. One of the leaders of the Norwegian Scandinavists, Professor Broch, has lately protested in public against the spread of Pangermanic ideas, and thus conceded their existence. Bismarck's plucky statesmanship seems to have won the admiration of the bitterest enemies of the Prussian

"Junkerthum," the peasantry, and it is therefore hardly to be expected that these "republicans under a monarchical mask," who have no taste for military glory, will approve of a Piedmontese policy. On the other hand, the Danes themselves (were we to judge from the fierce tone of the Copenhagen press) should be to a man Scandinavists, but in this instance the capital does not happen to reflect the opinion of the country. The rock of Panscandinavism may be clung to for salvation, because absorption by Sweden is preferable to absorption by Germany, but there is little love in the nation for those "brethren beyond the Sund" with whose ancestors Denmark has been engaged in a chronic family quarrel.

### THE INDIAN SUMMER OF LIFE.

*FUGACES labuntur anni.* The fugacious years are bound to glide on, yet their downward course is not always unchecked. Men's lives are prone to imitate the year in all its seasons, and have, like it, an Indian summer. Of which fifth season the time is rather indefinite, but it may be approximately placed between the ages of forty-five and fifty-five. There is then a sudden blossoming, a temporary rejuvenescence of the outward man. From being plain and careless in dress, he becomes neat and elegant, once more paying worship and tribute to the goddess Fashion. Perhaps he dyes his moustache and so much of his hair as remains; he will hardly go the length of a wig nowadays, when even youths are not ashamed of baldness. His out-door habits undergo a corresponding change. After many years' cessation from equestrian exercise, he exhibits himself on a fiery steed, or indulges in long country walks, as if to say, "My limbs are not stiff. You see that no gout or lumbago disables me."

About the same time, if he be a bachelor or, what is practically much the same, a widower of long standing, he comes once more into the matrimonial market. Not that he necessarily marries or thinks of marrying, but he is thought and spoken of by others as likely to marry. Young ladies of twenty-nine, or so, set their caps for him. Match-making mammas with elder daughters on hand put him down as a good *parti* or a "detrimental" (to borrow a term from our English cousins), according to the extent of his means or their ambition.

If he has his fruitful vine and olive branches, his Indian summer does not fail in consequence; on the contrary, it may often be traced, in part at least, directly to their influence. The eldest daughter is to be married, and papa has to get himself up grandly for the grand occasion and subsequent round of festivities, and is surprised to find how much better he feels and looks. Or the young gentleman of the family grows up to the age of sweldom, and (after the manner of the present race of young gentlemen) criticises his parents' attire and bearing. Or a resemblance discovered may evoke dormant vanity. It is a stock compliment, a well-worn *ficelle* of gallantry, to pretend to mistake the mother for the elder sister; but such illusions are not confined to the softer sex, and more than one man has dressed for the part of his own son.

From what has been said it might be supposed that the Indian summer of life is entirely dependent on, and measured by, material well-being, and that it is a natural result of that prosperous stage when the seed sown in early life has borne good fruit. Doubtless there is an epicurean element in the Indian summer of mortals, but it is not this one. Men may have grown poorer since their youth, and yet enjoy to the full the season of rejuvenescence; they may have grown richer, much richer, and yet miss it altogether. It generally comes, we think, to those who have ceased to be largely ambitious; it coincides with the settling down of their grand aspirations. When a man has given up expecting to be a great financier, or statesman, or author, or artist; when he has made up his mind that he will not live long enough to convert the corporation of New York, or any other heathen power; when he has convinced himself that his wife's *salon* will not leave a name in social history, that his daughter is not growing up a perfect Venus, or his son a second Crichton—when, in short, he deigns to take such goods as the gods have provided without fretting



about those which they have denied, then he is ripe for his Indian summer, and rarely misses it.

But this late after-bloom may have another and a higher cause, though it is one which to ardent young men and cynical elders appears supremely ridiculous. The assertion that even at an advanced stage of life it is possible to be truly in love, always provokes a storm of sarcasm. But the deriders make a very common mistake, a mistake almost universal indeed among that large portion of mankind which prefers effect to accuracy. They make their general rule absolute, and allow no exceptions. An old bachelor is apt to be selfish; therefore all old bachelors are selfish. A second marriage is often a matter of calculation and convenience; therefore it must invariably and inevitably be such. For the honor of human nature we protest against this imperfect generalization. No! it is not true, as these cynics affirm, that a man past forty is incapable of a serious and unselfish attachment. It is not true—any more than it is true that a woman past thirty is necessarily what a sporting character would call "an old peltier," a battered steeple-chaser of flirtations. Some persons wear out their hearts, as others their bodies, prematurely; but because there are men of fifty who cannot walk ten miles or ride twenty without suffering, shall we say that either feat is impossible for a man of sixty?

Whatever its causes, the Indian summer of life is an "institution" to be cherished. Many physical and moral influences tend to make Americans prematurely old, and the rising generation is always ready enough to push us from our stools. Our young people assume as an axiom that "age is unnecessary," and are anxious to bring down the term *age* to a very low figure. There are other things that hasten its approach beside climate and hard work. Men grow old by "letting themselves go," by neglecting their external appearance and ordinary comforts. It is well both subjectively and objectively, both for the individual and for society, to struggle against such influences, and save our Indian summer, at least, from the great destroyer.

#### SPAIN'S FUTURE GOVERNMENT.

SPAIN is one of those things of which the more one learns the less he finds that he really knows. Deductions which, when we last wrote on the subject—soon after the success of the revolution—seemed, from the knowledge we then had, legitimate enough, have in some instances been justified and in others discredited, for the time at any rate, by a course or events as unexpected as it is gratifying. The presumed turpitude of the Spanish character entered pretty largely into all the calculations which at first men made with regard to the future of Spain; but it would be difficult to conceive how a nation could conduct itself under a crucial test with more moderation and credit than this singularly little known people has from the first continued to do. That the Spaniards would precipitately rush into a republic, which should prove the direful spring of woes unnumbered, was what most outside observers—what we, at least—anticipated. That the woes must inevitably attend the republic seemed to us a natural inference from the characteristics attributed to the people, their ignorance—nearly twelve millions out of the less than sixteen millions of population being unable to read and write,—and their long subjection to priestcraft. Nothing seemed to us clearer than that self-government and the tyranny of the priests could not coexist, and nothing less likely than that an end could be put to the latter. But the encroachments of the priests have been undone at a blow and the Jesuits expelled; and the people, instead of being precipitate, or having their heads turned by intoxicating visions of liberty, are very deliberately considering—and this with an order and decorum, though in the midst of a still uncompleted revolution, that America or England may very well envy—what form of government it is most expedient for them to adopt. So there still remains the question which, little more than a month ago, it seemed almost folly to ask—*Can Spain become a republic?*

At the outset of the inquiry we are met by obstacles apparently insuperable in the way of her becoming anything else. The first requirement of any other form of government, constitutional or absolute—a sovereign—is not attainable. The exigencies of the case demand that, in the words of an English observer, any candi-

date for the position must be "Catholic, anti-priest, anti-Bourbon, anti-Orleanist, and acceptable to Spain." And we have no doubt that these qualifications are as essential as they are irreconcilable. It is true that, in his letter to M. Emile de Girardin, General Prim represents the advocates of a republic as in the same dilemma. It is impossible, he says, to have a republic without republicans, and he is of opinion that republicans do not exist in Spain in adequate numbers. But this alleged republican deficiency is not so final, not so immediately conclusive, as the very certain monarchical one. At the worst, it is quite possible to *try* a republic, whether there are republicans or not,—but as for a monarchy, unless it has something, if only a baby, which shall personate a monarch, not even Mrs. Chick could induce a sensible nation to make the effort. Besides, there is room for doubt about the destitution of republicans, or at least of reasonably good raw material for their manufacture. According to *The Spectator*, a sort of instinct for a republic manifests itself spontaneously in the Spanish people, like the instinct to build houses and dams in a beaver. "The moment the people are let alone," it says, "they organize provincial or municipal juntas, or committees by election, and, when elected, obey them very strictly. Their natural and almost irrepressible tendency is to appoint a committee for each great commune, a larger committee for each province, and a central committee for the whole country, adding generally some popular chief as head of the Executive." In that there would seem to inhere very much of the essence of a republic. Nor is this all: in certain districts of Spain, in Catalonia especially, the people are alert, enterprising, progressive, and are quite decided in a devotion to democratic principles which those familiar with the community concur in stating that it would be unsafe to disregard. Nothing is more noteworthy in the composition of the state than the manner in which the different provinces have preserved their individuality,—the descendants of the Portuguese, the Goths, the Numidians, the Moors, still retaining the traditions and temperaments of their ancestors, and constituting the elements of ethnologically defined states over which, as members of a federal republic, it would be impossible to re-establish the centralization that has hitherto been the bane of the kingdom. Moreover, against the assertion of General Prim—who, to be sure, ought to know what he is talking about—we have this deduction, which *The Pall Mall Gazette* declares to be "the common voice of every person who knows anything about Spain,"—that "the common people, especially the peasantry, are the best part of the population, and that the classes which have hitherto monopolized power at the seat of government are the worst part of it." Add to all this that the condition of Spain has actually been for weeks that of a republic,—that the Cortes which are to meet next month to determine the question of the future polity will be elected by the suffrage of a populace who, having once tasted power, will not easily relinquish it,—that while the monarchists, divided in sentiment and with no definite course to propose, have steadily lost power by delay, the republicans have been diligently at work and organizing under able leaders,—and there is little doubt that the republic will at least be attempted.

Whether it can last is a question to which, with the little knowledge attainable of contemporary Spain, it is impossible to give a confident answer. We cannot attach much weight, on the one hand, to the assurances of failure volunteered by monarchists, whom the conditions of self-preservation impel to the exercise of a reversed Monroe Doctrine and the discouragement of freedom in any quarter whence its contagion may affect themselves; nor, on the other, to the acclamations either of the extravagant European republicans, whose hatred for monarchy is quite as strong as their sentimental attachment to liberty, or of our own countrymen who have so profound a conviction that democratic propagandism anywhere is to our national glory that they would not hesitate to affirm the desirableness of a republic for the masses in China or in British India. The geographical position of Spain and political situation of Europe, insuring the Peninsula against outside interference, together with the internal characteristics we have enumerated, constitute the only good reasons we know for auguring well for the re-

public. Against its chances for existence weighty considerations are to be set. As we have argued on another occasion in speaking of Spain, the lesson of experience is that self-government is impossible for any non-Teutonic or for any Roman Catholic people. Nothing can be more absurd than the gratulations one encounters on what certain classes of Protestants are pleased to consider Spain's abandonment of Rome. Instead of the ecclesiastical confiscations and exiles meaning anything of that sort, or being calculated to insure any such result, there is sound reason in the argument put forth in the manifesto of the provisional government, that the proclamation of religious freedom will in reality strengthen the Roman Catholic Church in Spain. Indeed, two provinces at least have refused to permit the expulsion of the Jesuits, and throughout the rural districts and villages the priesthood—not the monks—will probably be found to retain such power over the affections and fears of the people as would make their political expression of opinion delusive, and self-government a sham and a snare. Something of this sort would seem to have suggested itself to the priests; for it appears that they, in alliance with the Carlists—both of them about as well affected toward democracy as the ex-Queen herself,—are covertly stimulating the efforts for the establishment of the republic. It may be that they reckon on their ability to exercise under it, by dint of cajoleries and combinations, a degree of power—and therefore of harmfulness—beyond their grasp under other than a popular government. It may be that they purpose fomenting, in the event of its adoption, such scenes of turbulence and anarchy as—thanks largely to the clergy—characterize the Spanish-American republics, thereby renewing the scarcely yet dispelled odium into which Liberty was brought by the French Revolution, and giving to absolutism—spiritual and temporal—a new lease of life. That such hands should offer such a gift has a sinister import. There is an ugly resemblance to the Grecian wiles which brought Trojan valor to naught—"Equo ne credite, Teucri!"

#### CONSTITUTIONAL EXPOSITION.

THE safeguards of our constitutional liberty continue to be of absorbing interest to our thinkers, as is evinced by numerous favorable, and some adverse, comments upon our review (in No. 194) of Hon. A. H. Stephens's and Professor J. A. Jameson's expositions of our federal system. We select for a few remarks a well-written letter—to be found in another column—in which it is argued, or assumed, that consolidation is accomplished, and that now, instead of a federation, we have a "national unity," with the counties of New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and others, just as New York has the counties of Westchester, Rockland, Orange, Ulster, and others. As a gracious concession, and to gradually reconcile the *quondam* states to their degradation, we presume they will be allowed to call themselves states awhile longer. But let us quote.

Mr. Elmer says that the question whether sovereignty "resided in the aggregate population of the United States," "or in the people of the several states," was settled by the recent contest in favor of consolidation; and he hopes that "all will be contented with the fact of national unity." "At most," he continues, "it was a question of construction. The state-rights party . . . staked all on their view of the Constitution, and lost. That instrument must now be held to be the social compact of the whole people of the republic."

In assuming that the war was waged for a construction, and that force has consolidated the states into a "national unity," Mr. Elmer ignores two or three important fundamental ideas: 1. That nothing of government is ever settled permanently in a republic—not even the organic laws; for the reason that the people have the absolute right to govern themselves, so that, everything of polity being the offspring of their will, they can, as long as their freedom or republican character continues, change their will—and consequently their government—at pleasure. We are in a republic, and must accept its conditions. 2. The result of the recent contest was simply the fact that one of the contending parties was the stronger, and was entitled to the establishment of its will; but it is equally true that such will must be



written as law before it is to be heeded, for our polity is a written one, and acts of rulers unwarranted by it are usurpatory and void. And these functionaries can assume no other will of the people, as a rule or warrant of action, than what is written in the Constitution. As vicarious rulers, they have the same words, figures, punctuation, and meaning of the federal instrument for their guidance—and their oath imports the same obligation—as ever. If, then, no abolition of states, or of equality of states, or of representation of states has been provided for in writing, it must be admitted that our name is still correct—"the United States." If, therefore, Mr. Elmer desire a change, he must go to the people, who have the power, and persuade them to declare as law the "national unity" which he says is established. Till they do so, we must all abide by the individuality of existence and will of states, as we have it now. 3. Our polity is self-government; and our states, which have been coerced to return (or remain), are under the Constitution, which only contemplates, and provides for, republics. So that they must henceforth govern themselves in, and not out of, the Union. But federal functionaries, being sworn to support the federal compact, have no right to treat states as unequal, and tax them without allowing them representation—no right, in other words, to restrict republican self-government.

Not one word of the Constitution has been changed, either as to parties or sources of authority; so our system is just as it has been—"the United States." And no one who understands the subject thoroughly, can suppose it to be "a mere question of construction," whether "a national unity," or an association of states, is provided for in the Constitution. There is no evidence of an undivided nation, with merely provincial subdivisions. Like his collaborators in what they are pleased to term construction, this writer quotes no authorities in support of his views, but feebly reproduces the old arguments of Story and Webster. Ten words, such as the following from Hamilton, were worth a thousand pages of respectable modern assertion. Said Hamilton, "The states are the essential component parts of our system." Said Sherman, the federal government is "instituted by a number of sovereign states, for the better security of their rights." Said Madison, "The states are regarded as distinct and independent sovereigns by the Constitution." No one of the fathers contradicted these views, but many spoke or wrote similarly; and yet Mr. Elmer ventures to say, without any proof, that the people of the states are bound by "social compact" into a "national unity."

The intrinsic evidence against Mr. Elmer is yet more decisive, for the Constitution declares, in the seventh and characterizing article, that it is established by and "between the states" that ratify it. This is corroborated by its calling the association "the United States." Moreover, the phrase—"union of states," is several times repeated (Art. I., § 2; Art. IV., §§ 3, 4). Nay, more, all the people of the country are called "citizens of states" (Art. IV., § 2; Art. III., § 2; amendments, Art. IX.) And, finally, no members of the "national unity," or homogeneous state or nation, are provided for, referred to, or even contemplated. We should like Mr. Elmer to be pleased, but really we must protest against his revolutionizing our time-honored "federal system."

And there is another formidable difficulty Mr. Elmer does not seem to contemplate. Mr. Webster wrote, near the close of his life, that "the states are united, confederated—not, chaos-like, together crushed and bruised." But here comes a new bruiser, and, at a blow, knocks the states all into one. We protest, in the name of New York and her neighbors, against this radical change. We have now equal sisters, voluntarily dwelling together in a harmonious system, tested by experience, and

"Very pleasant 'tis to see  
Sisters dwell in unity."

But crushing and bruising the said sisters into a "national unity" against their will is as shocking in idea as it would be absurd and criminal in fact. The war was not waged against these states. How, therefore, could they lose their integrity and sovereignty by the force of it? If they do not, the others do not, for equality of states is a necessity in our system. If it be said that New York used the force, and must be bound by the legitimate consequence, we insist that

she, and not Mr. Elmer, shall draw the inference. When she puts it in her home, or federal, organic law that she has lost her statehood, we will submit to it, and confess her degradation. She had a chance to do so last year, the third of peace; and after "long debate which of the two to choose," her old status or a new one, she left the following expressions of her sovereignty will standing on her record:

1. She ordained, as did every original state, the federal Constitution to be her compact, and her "supreme law" over her citizens. Her words, ordaining said Constitution, are as follows: ". . . We, the delegates, in the name and behalf of the people of the state of New York, do, by these presents, assent to and ratify the said Constitution."

2. In her fundamental law she declares that "the people of this state" have the "right of sovereignty" (Art. I., § 11). "The sovereignty and jurisdiction of this state extend to all places within the boundaries thereof" (*Rev. Stat.*, chap. i., tit. 2, § 1). And "the United States" has no foothold and right to stay and exercise jurisdiction on the soil of New York except by her permission, and under her sovereign grant. Look at the one hundred and fifty-seven cessions of use and jurisdiction by New York to the United States, to be found in the first volume of the *Revised Statutes*—all with conditions like the following, in the cession of use and jurisdiction of the soil of Brooklyn Navy-yard, and of Watervliet Arsenal: "The United States are to retain such use and jurisdiction so long as said tract shall be applied to the defence and safety of the said state, and no longer." Now, Mr. Elmer, is New York sovereign, or merged in a "national unity"? Has the federal Constitution any force in New York, except from her sovereign will? Can the United States have foothold in New York, otherwise than by grant from her as the sovereign—she having the absolute "lordship of the soil"?

3. Will Mr. Elmer kindly read the following, and say whether it is the sovereignty or the mere impudence of New York that is expressed?—"No authority can, on any pretence whatsoever, be exercised over the citizens of this state but such as is, or shall be, derived from, or granted by, the people of this state" (*I. Rev. Stat.*, chap. iv., § 1). Does that mean "national unity," with New York a county? Does it mean, as was written by a citizen of New York for the Philadelphia convention; "absolute supremacy of the government," and "allegiance of the states thereto"? Does it mean that a citizen of New York can, as a federal officer (his right to be such officer being given solely by her), drown the above tones of her sovereign voice with the tinkle of his "little bell," and wrest from under her very *axis*, to bastile or hang, "without due process of law," the best and bravest of her sons? "National unity" means "yes" to all these questions, but the state of New York means "no," and we hope she will mean so for ever!

And even under the law and usages of nations no such result as Mr. Elmer predicates of our war could take place; for after the contest is over, the belligerents meet and reduce to writing the results obtained by force, and until this settlement their citizens have nothing to take cognizance of and obey. *A fortiori*, it is so with us, for what is not written is not law.

The truth is, Mr. Elmer's wish is father to his thought, and the latter has no grandparents. At all events, he and his school seem to have no "fathers" to quote from. And as weakness generally panoplies itself in strong words, Mr. Stephens's book and our review—both replete with the highest possible proofs of their correctness—are said not to be "relevant to anything at this time but revolution;" and our reproduction of the history and records of the country, and the precious words of the founders of our constitutional liberty, is characterized as "a piece of baleful madness, which lacks only action to be a crime!"

Finally, we believe that three-fourths or more of the people of the country are in favor of the Constitution as written and contemporaneously explained by the founders of it. And we close with a passage written in 1789 by Samuel Adams to Elbridge Gerry, who was then in Congress, in regard to the necessity of adopting what is now the tenth amendment, which passage, while it fairly shows the ideas actuating the fathers, exhibits to our people a part of their inheritance of wisdom, and tends to allay the patriotic fears of Mr. Elmer as to the danger to result from perpetuating statehood.

"They [leading Federalists] wish to see drawn, as clearly as may be, a line between the federal powers vested in Congress, and the distinct sovereignty of the several states, upon which the private and personal rights of the citizens depend. Without such distinction there will be danger of the Constitution issuing imperceptibly and gradually into a consolidated government over all the states, which, though it may be wished for by some, was reprobated in the idea by the highest advocates of the Constitution." And after alluding to peculiarities of climate, circumstances, education, customs, feeling, and home interests, as making independent local governments necessary, he concludes that the people "under one consolidated government cannot long remain free." (See *Adams's Life*, etc., Vol. III., p. 272, et seq.) And on August 24, 1789, he wrote to R. H. Lee on the same subject as follows: "Such a government," "pervading and legislating through all the states, not for federal purposes only, but in all cases whatsoever, would soon annihilate the sovereignty of the several states—so necessary to the support of the confederated commonwealth—and sink both in despotism." If our federal government is now a "national sovereignty," and the final judge as to its powers, may we not soon realize the "legislating in all cases whatsoever" of a centralized despotism to be reared by "construction" upon the ruins of the heretofore associated commonwealths—"the United States"?

#### THE VEHICLE OF THE FUTURE.

THIS is an age and a land of progress. Our chief solicitude in life is to get on; our loftiest ambition to get on a little faster than our neighbors. Eating, drinking, marrying and repenting, making money and losing it, living and dying, we do all things in a hurry, and the one reproach under which an American writhes most painfully and, to do him justice, seldome deserves, is that he is slow. Nor has this mania for speed a metaphorical confinement to our mental development or material success, to our personal or national greatness; it manifests itself even in our physical motion. The thing which strikes a foreigner most curiously on first setting foot in one of our bustling towns is the headlong gait, the frantic rush and skurry, of the people about him. Everybody seems to be engaged in a breathless race against time, which it is a matter of honor to win. Perhaps it is in this peculiarity of temperament that we shall find the secret of that national distaste for walking which so wakes the wonder, and to some extent the scorn, of pedestrian English tourists. Walking is, in fact, too slow for us; five thousand years of reflection and experience have failed to teach us the art of putting into human muscles the speed and endurance of equine. That is the reason why every proper-minded American is taught to regard his life as incomplete until it is rounded into symmetry by the possession of at least one first-class trotter of undoubted pedigree and extraordinary speed, an animal that will make his mile inside of three minutes, and can do ever so much better if he is put to it, you know—which of course he never is. But to attain that summit of felicity demands a certain plenitude of pocket, which is not, more's the pity, necessarily an attendant of virtuous liberty. As the poet feelingly observes:

"Them that's rich, they rides in chaises,  
But them that's poor, by gracious, they must walk."

Horse-flesh is an expensive luxury which, for most of us, resides in a far off land of dim desire and futile expectation. To be sure there are the public conveyances, the street-cars, the omnibuses, the cabs, the hacks, and for longer distances the railways, but all these together only partially and very insufficiently satisfy our needs. What one wants is a method of locomotion which shall be at one's undivided service always and at any moment, and which shall at the same time be simple, easily kept in order, and, above all, inexpensive. And lo! from across the water on the wings of the lightning is wafted a second triumphant Eureka! from another Archimedes who has found the lever to move all the world, one at a time.

We have yet to learn whose genius it was that conceived the happy thought of adapting a toy to the needs and uses of civilized society, of converting a child's plaything into an engine of mature and practical usefulness. Other inventors, Watt and Fulton and Morse and Greeley, we have honored and rewarded for their beneficent ingenuity, but here is a greater than these, whose name seems destined to elude the praises and thanksgiving of an admiring posterity. To him shall there be no monuments; no



literary institute, no young ladies' seminary, no washerwomen's mutual benevolent society, nor any baby or patent boot-jack, shall be called by his honored name; no colleges are to make him learned of divinity or law; he will be elected president of no Sunday-School Union; he will be sent as minister to no foreign court; his private life and family secrets will be paraded in no enterprising newspaper; he will not even be nominated to Congress. Of course he is an American; all inventors are either Americans or plagiarists. And so as Americans we mourn the envious obscurity which robs him, and his country through him, of the merited fame of his great discovery. But that discovery itself we hail as one of the most momentous discoveries of our age, and we do not at all hesitate to claim for it the proud eminence of the Vehicle of the Future.

Of course the most obtuse of readers has long before guessed that we mean the steam buggy, of which we not long since had a trial in our streets. Equally, of course, the most amiable of obtuse readers will be profoundly indignant at learning that his guess was very stupid indeed, and that we didn't mean anything of the sort. What we did allude to was the velocipede. Now, we do not mean to attempt any technical description of this invention, which would be as superfluous as it would be impossible. Everybody has seen and probably had justifiable occasion to swear at those little three-wheeled wagons which children propel rapidly through the streets by means of levers attached to the wheels. And how they do it we have always regarded as a profound mystery. On the only occasion when we were tempted by extreme inexperience and a rash trust in fortune to enter a machine of the sort we found it utterly refractory. Our most laborious efforts failed to move more than one wheel at a time, or to induce it to go forward except when we wanted it to go backward, or backward unless we tried to make it go forward. We finally gave up the contest and abandoned it to its own devices, a confidence which it basely repaid by upsetting us into the nearest gutter. But this is a digression. Everybody has seen a child's velocipede. Well, it is only necessary to imagine something on the same principle as utterly unlike this as possible, and, *voilà tout!* you have the regenerated and reconstructed velocipede of the future which is destined to supersede hackney coaches, to bankrupt street-railway companies, to make omnibuses only a tradition in the land. Any one with a tolerably fervid imagination can easily do it, but when you come to depict to yourself the mighty change, the great social revolution, that is to be wrought by the introduction of the velocipede into common use, the imagination fairly reels under the pressure of multitudinous possibilities. It is here that the calm prescience of the journalist steps in, a *Deus ex machina*, to the assistance of the bewildered reader. He waves his magic pen, and presto! the curtain of the future straightway uncloses and reveals a marvellous scene.

It is Broadway, let us say, at noonday. The sidewalks, it will be observed, have disappeared; there is no longer any need of them, for there are no longer any pedestrians. Immense numbers of velocipedes glide swiftly to and fro over the tessellated pavement. By an act of the One Hundred and Forty-first Congress, passed unanimously over the veto of Perpetual President Grant (who, it is rumored, is in his dotage and constantly murmurs in scarce intelligible accents, "L's h'v' p'ce," except when he is talking velocipede), business velocipedes have been banished under penalty of death to the neighboring streets, and only pleasure vehicles fill with radiance of color and motion the great thoroughfare of the world's metropolis, which of course New York has now become. All sorts and sizes of velocipedes are before us, gayly painted and adorned, from the substantial eight-wheeled establishment wherein old Grönbachs the banker rolls staidly down to Wall Street, to the natty little two-wheeled beauty which his lovely and accomplished daughter, Sophronisba Jane, guides dexterously at lightning speed from shop to shop, with the dearest little love of a tiger grinning with folded arms from a high seat behind her. It will be observed that great improvements have been made in the machine, and that it is now adapted to all the purposes and requirements of life. In the side streets we shall see how it is turned into van or truck, butcher's cart or doctor's gig, indifferently. But in the Park, which another wave of the enchanter's pen presently reveals, we see its culminating splendor. On the panels of that magnificent family velocipede, brilliant with gold and crimson, we discern the crest of Julius Beaumont, the wealthy agent of the Swartzschilds. Behind him rolls the stately turnout of Tudor, the dry-goods king;

while flashing past with glory of flying wheels we just recognize the Rev. Henry Norwood Screecher and Mr. Bonheur, of *The New York Dredger*, contending in friendly rivalry. There, too, is the celebrated Admiral Von Der Bilk, the railroad giant; and Sellembold, the wealthy druggist, on a velocipede of gold and velvet, in the minute arabesque tracery of whose adornments one may detect the names of his famous compounds; and Horace Squealy, of *The Daily Costermonger*; in a word, all the notables of the town. And conspicuous above all the rest for the symmetry of its framework, the showiness of its plate, and the skill of its handling is the matchless four-in-foot of Mr. Chrysostom Z. Bellows. Nowhere any longer, except in the restaurant, is horse-flesh to be seen; and unless for very long and tiresome journeys, where time is not a consideration, we dispense even with steam. On yonder fence you may read the announcement of the Fall Meeting at Chrysostom Park with the names of the famous velocipedes that may be expected to compete, and here, in this circus bill, is a thrilling illustration of Mr. Tompkins's celebrated feat on four velocipedes. As we are gazing a bugle sounds and a squadron of cavalry wheels gayly into the scene. Perhaps we should rather call them velocipedalry, for they, too, follow the prevailing fashion. It has been found that velocipedes are much more serviceable than horses in battle; they are more lasting, more easily managed, and much less likely to run away from the enemy against the will of the valorous rider. At first a little difficulty was experienced in the matter of jumping fences and ditches, but that has been obviated by an ingenious arrangement of springs. The brilliant cortège sweeps by with jingling sabres and waving plumes, the bugle-blare dies away in the distance, the younger ladies of our audience have scarcely done admiring the skill and grace with which the remarkably handsome officer in command manages his spirited velocipede when the enchanted wand ceases to move, the curtain falls, and we awake from the pleasant dream to the frightful reality of street-cars and omnibuses.

But let us possess our souls in patience; it is a dream that must surely be realized. The time will undoubtedly come when the velocipede will justify our prophecy and reign supreme until that perfect day when balloon voyaging shall be reduced to rules and limits, and we shall open at our breakfast-table invitations to dine in Paris and to dance at Pekin.

#### INSIDE.

A SERIES of highly interesting lectures on anatomy and physiology commenced at the Cooper Institute on Monday, the 9th. Most of us can recollect that blissful time when we regarded the interior of our bodies as something like the inside of an empty pillow-case, and its function as simply that of holding as many cakes and apples as the said pillow-case could contain. The first glimmer of the truth, the first knowledge that the stomach was only one of many curious and ugly things that we carried about with us, was instantly connected with the painful idea that our previous admeasurement of our just allowance of cakes and apples must thenceforth be sadly curtailed.

Further than this many of us have not gone yet, and of those who have gone further the greater number even of well-informed people are in a state of haze, not at all satisfactory, seeing that more accurate knowledge is sometimes much to be desired. But schools of anatomy, *i. e.*, dissecting-rooms, are not to be lightly entered, books of anatomy are dry, repulsive, and very puzzling to the imagination, and what is needed is precisely what the Cooper Union has presented to us: models, accurate, complete, and made of the only material which, for the purpose, is sufficiently light, firm, and elastic—papier-mâché; that is, paper moistened, reduced to a paste, moulded, dried, and painted. Such models, constructed under the eye of an anatomist, are only made in France, and small *mannequins* for the use of medical students are often imported; but we can well believe that nothing so extensive as the collection of Dr. Lemerrier has ever before been exhibited in public, and we can testify that the famous collection of wax models in Florence does not, to ignorant eyes, convey half so much information.

On Monday evening the whole process of nutrition was made clear not only to the imagination but to the sight, and we doubt not that the following lectures on other functions, and on the structure of the horse, the fish, of plants, etc., will be equally lucid and instructive. With Dr. Lemerrier himself the audience appeared much pleased. His slow and laborious use of English makes it somewhat fatiguing to follow him,

but it is evident that he knows the language well, though unused to speaking it, for he makes no mistakes, and, what is of more consequence, never repeats himself, but gives his explanations with a clearness which marks the scientific mind. His *dissection*, as he justly calls it, of his models—the way in which he took off layer after layer of muscles, tendons, nerves, and veins, explaining the while the uses of each—was heartily applauded, and at the end of a most instructive evening the only thought that dashed our pleasure was the reflection that Dr. Lemerrier and his assistants would probably be obliged to sit up until three in the morning to put all his wonderful models together again.

#### MY RELIGION.

BY A MODERN MINISTER.

#### XIII.

#### GROWTH.

"But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ; from whom the whole body, fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love."—PAUL.

THE object of faith and knowledge is *the Son of God*. This designation of our Lord declares Him to be of the same nature with the Father, possessing the same attributes and entitled to the same honor. Were this not the case the knowledge of Christ as the Son of God could not be eternal life. It could not fill, enlarge, and sanctify, and render blessed the soul, nor constitute the goal of our high calling, the full perfection of our nature. The Apostle Paul presents the unity of the faith as the goal of perfection, though he also says that we have already "one faith," as we have one Lord and one baptism. Unity is a matter of degrees. The church is now, and ever has been, one body, how imperfect soever the union among the members. Our Lord's praying that His people may be one does not prove that they are not now one. The unity of faith is now confined to the first principles. The unity of which is the perfection of Christianity implies perfect knowledge and perfect holiness. We are all to "come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." The standard of perfection for the church is complete conformity to Christ.

We are all of us, therefore, continually to approximate to this standard. We are never to be satisfied with anything short of it. We are never to be diverted from progress toward it. We are not to be turned aside and tossed about by erroneous doctrine, but we must adhere to the truth in love. It is not mere stability in doctrine, either, but faith combined with love that is required. The only saving salutary faith is that which works by love and purifies the heart. By the exercise of this faith and love we are to *grow up* unto Him, to become like Him. We are to be conformed to Him who is our Head, *because* He is our Head; *i. e.*, because of the intimate union between Him and us, which alone renders such conformity practicable.

*The church is Christ's body. He is the head.* Individual Christians are *members* of the body. The very word "member" implies this. It denotes one of the limbs of a body. When we talk, therefore, of "members" of the church we mean members of Christ's body. The church is Christ's body; individual Christians are members of Christ, just because pervaded by His life. As in the human body, the vitality which has its seat in the head pervades the whole body, furnishing life and health to every limb, and by its pervasive power constituting it a member of the living organism, so is the body of Christ. Or, to use the words of the apostle, "so is the Christ." He and His body are one; so that He and they together are called by His name, "the Christ."

The moment that we yield up ourselves unto Him; the moment we throw wide open the door of the heart to Him that He may enter in and dwell there, and rule and reign there for ever; the moment we trust in Him as the author of eternal life to us; that moment, by His divine and spiritual energy, does He communicate of His own divine and spiritual life unto us, so that He lives in us, working in us both to will and to do, guiding, directing, actuating our every thought, word, and deed (so far as we yield ourselves unto Him), just as the head guides, directs, and actuates the movements of the human body and of the various members thereof.

Now, the body of Christ *grows*. It is not merely increased in size by aggregation, as a heap of stones might be; but it grows from within, like a living organism. The perfection of the body is the perfect development of every member thereof.



This growth is from Christ; "from whom the whole body maketh increase." He is the causal source from whom all life and power are derived. "As the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given the Son to have life in Himself." "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." He has come into the world that we "might have life, and have it more abundantly." "Of His fulness have all we received." Of the fulness of the Divine Life manifested in Him He communicates unto His people; and as they receive it from Him they grow: grow in grace; grow in knowledge; grow in Christliness, in Godlikeness. There is no other source of holiness, of happiness, of growth in the things of the Divine Life.

It is vain to attempt to develop any real or supposed germ of goodness within, whether natural or acquired. Goodness is but *Godness*; and cut off from God, it dies. It cannot maintain its own life, much less develop or propagate itself, even under the most careful culture. Goodness is the very life of God. It exists in Jesus Christ for us. He communicates of it unto us as we come to Him for it. And more and more, day by day, as we need it more and more—as we depend upon it more and more.

Union with Christ is the indispensable condition of life and of growth to every member. And the more closely we adhere to Him, the more we rely upon Him to supply all our need, the more will it be supplied, the more healthful and earnest and joyful will be our life; the more decided, obvious, and positive our growth, until filled "with all the fulness of God."

This growth of the body of Christ depends on the intimate union, by appropriate bonds, of all the members with the Head: "The whole body, fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, maketh increase."

We grow in Godlikeness, it is true, in proportion as we cleave to Christ as the source of our souls' life. But this divine and heavenly life is ministered to us through appropriate means. The whole body of Christ, and every individual member thereof, most grows when every joint most perfectly receives and transmits the current of life. When the union of the body is most perfect, when every bond and ligament holds every joint in its proper position, when every member thus receives and distributes most perfectly the vitalizing force, then most rapidly does the whole body grow. But let some of the bands or ligaments be relaxed or broken; let some joint be so severed from the rest that it receives little and transmits less from the life, let the powers of absorption and assimilation be impeded, and the whole body suffers. Growth is hindered, and vital power impaired. "So is the Christ." If one member suffer, all the members suffer with it. If one grow, all grow. If all grow, every one grows.

This growth is symmetrical. It is according to the degree of divine influence, as ministered; "according to the effectual working in the measure of every part." "As the human body, bound together by the vital influence derived from the head through appropriate channels, and distributed to every member and organ according to its function, constantly advances to maturity, so the Church, united as one body by the divine influence flowing from Christ its head through appropriate channels, and distributed to every member according to his peculiar capacity and function, continually advances toward perfection. And as in the human body no one member, whether hand or foot, can live and grow unless in union with the body, so union with the body of Christ is the indispensable condition of growth in every individual believer. And further, as in the human body there are certain channels through which the vital influence flows from the head to the members, and which are necessary to its communication, so also there are certain divinely appointed means for the distribution of the Holy Spirit from Christ to the several members of His body."

It is necessary for the well-being of the whole that every member be in living, active communion with the complete organism, and perform his own proper function in the body. The unity necessary to the proper growth is "compacted by that which every joint supplieth." The degree of development is "according to the effectual working in the measure of every part." Every member is necessary. The growth of the body of Christ is a growth in love. One of the conditions is speaking the truth, or rather professing and adhering to the truth in love—being sincere in love. It must be so. To grow in Christ is to become more and more a partaker of the divine nature. And that nature is love. "God is Love." And he that most partakes of the divine nature in

Christ is most nearly made perfect in love. Hence it is impossible but that one who loves God loves his brother also. It is his nature to love. He cannot help it. He would not help it for the world. His love to his fellows is the very manifestation in the Christian's soul of the life of God within. When he feels within him the fervent glow of affection toward his fellows; when that affection is a moving principle of his life, prompting him to words and deeds of love to those who love the same Saviour; he knows that he is born of God, and the divine and heavenly nature runs over in happiness and in holiness, and that more and more continually.

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

### CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ROUND TABLE:

SIR: Mr. C. N. Featherston, of Rome, Georgia, in his letter to you, published in *The Round Table* of October 31, has, in a very courteous manner, complimented your article on *Constitutional Interpretations*, and taken an exception to your statement that "our state-rights men do not clearly understand their own platform." He informs you what latitudes the state-rights men inhabit, and gently admonishes you that politicians residing north of Mason's line are not authority on the subject of state sovereignty. He then proceeds to quote for you from Calhoun's works the exact doctrine held by the state-rights party in the South, and concludes with the following sketch of their present position:

"That party are now silent—bewildered somewhat by the rude rebuff administered by the war. They are not in a position to insist on their platform. . . . It would be unavailing, perhaps unbecoming, in them to insist that the general government has, during the last eight years, been acting beyond the charter of its powers. Beside, sir, it is a matter of doubt with them whether our form of government has not, by usurpation and the force of events, been radically changed, and state sovereignty for ever lost."

I think the exception to your statement was well taken. He is evidently correct as to the location of the state-rights party; and the picture he has drawn is, I fear, accurate. I am sorry that it is so. I know that state sovereignty as understood by them is for ever lost. I regret that they have any doubt at all about it; and I regret still more that they think it has been lost in any degree by usurpation. I am thankful, many of their friends in the North will be thankful, for the doubt, so far as it goes, and for all the comfort that it implies. We had hoped for clear convictions on this subject, and for a frank and cordial acceptance of the principle of the unity of the people of this republic, but we are fain to be encouraged by the assurance that there is a doubt of the infallibility of state sovereignty. This doctrine of state sovereignty, as enunciated by Calhoun, seems to be a welcome one to your correspondent, and, pardon me, to you also. Your article (*Constitutional Interpretations*) is, to Mr. Featherston, "an invincible array of fact and argument against the consolidation theory." I do not question the ability of that article, nor that of Mr. Stephens's book, of which it was, in part, a review. I do not agree with either, nor purpose to answer either. Neither is relevant to anything, at this time, but revolution. What good purpose does either Mr. Stephens's exhaustive review of all the arguments on the subject, or your "invincible array," or Mr. Featherston's laudation of your "invincible array," serve at this time? It occurs to me that the whole case has been decided—not by usurpation, but by the force of events, if you please. It seems to me there can be no doubt at all about what was decided, and no ground for a reargument. Admitting that up to the late contest it was politically (for judicially it was not) an open question whether sovereignty, in whole or in part, resided in the aggregate population of the United States, as denied by Mr. Calhoun, or in the people of the several states, as claimed by him, that question was settled by that contest in favor of national unity. At most it was a question of construction. The state-rights party, as defined by Mr. Featherston, staked all on their view of the Constitution, and lost. That instrument must now be held to be the social compact of the whole people of the republic. Against this rule of construction, this meaning of the Constitution, it was that the state-rights party appealed to arms and was defeated. The decision was adverse to them, and it does seem to me to be the merest folly for them now to doubt its extent or binding force, or argue over again the grounds on which it rests. Of course Mr. Stephens had a right to make a book, and you had a right to review it. I would not abridge the freedom of the press. I prefer to excuse an ill-advised use of that freedom. If the "invincible array" was produced by you in the interests of literature, merely to show as a matter of fact and history that there existed certain arguments in favor of inflated state sovereignty, that is well enough; I like your enterprise. If Mr. Stephens produced his constitutional view of the war between the states to show the people of the world the grounds and foundations upon which he supported secession, to quiet his conscience, and excuse himself before his countrymen for the part he took in the attempt to destroy his government, or to prove his head rather than his heart at fault, we may say, "Very well, Mr. Stephens, we will look over your book and give you credit for the effort." It does no harm to hear a man explain himself. But if these arguments are presented at this

time as a basis upon which to rally a political party, tending as that would to reproduce in our land the scenes of the last eight years, it is a piece of baleful madness which lacks only action to be crime.

I sincerely hope that your correspondent's doubt whether state sovereignty be lost will ripen into a certainty that it is. I hope the people of the South will come to the same conclusion. I hope all will become contented with the fact of our national unity; and to this end I ask them to consider whether the danger from anarchy and disorder, under the practical operation of their idea of state sovereignty, would not be greater than the danger from despotism under what they are pleased to term the consolidation theory. Also, under which system would the welfare of the people of the whole land be best promoted?

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

HENRY ELMER.

### ARTICLE X. OF MY RELIGION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ROUND TABLE:

SIR: By the feeble light of reason given to man we see all things as "through a glass, darkly." Nevertheless, we do see and are able somewhat to discern the true from the false. Why should we then, in matters temporal or spiritual, ever cast aside the light, and submit ourselves to the entire guidance of a blind faith?

Now, there is nothing created that is thoroughly comprehensible to the finite human reason. On the contrary, most things are nearly incomprehensible. Still, nothing that exists in opposition to facts known to our own limited understanding. That is, things are not, whose existence is impossible from the nature of things, as really understood by our reason. Now it seems to me, when we are asked to believe in doctrines as put forth by our "Modern Minister" in his article on the *Mystical Union*, that we are called upon to put our faith in a theological theory that is not only incomprehensible, but impossible; that we are called upon to do in spiritual matters what we could never be prevailed upon to do in matters temporal, to throw aside the light by which we are enabled to see darkly and grope inanely after the sounds from the voices of our ecclesiastical leaders.

Look at the comparison used by the Modern Minister to illustrate his idea in regard to the mystical union of the Three—that of the union of the body and the soul in the composition of the man. That this latter union is incomprehensible cannot be gainsaid. Nor is it impossible. But if it were to be stated that the body were one and the same thing with the soul, and the soul one and the same thing with the man, justifying an almost indiscriminate use of appellations, would it not be an endeavor to maintain not only an incomprehensibility, not only an impossibility, but also an absurdity? Now, is it not precisely an analogous proposition which our Modern Minister endeavors to inculcate, and does not his theory conflict with simple axioms that we know to be absolutely true? If any whole be made up of two or more unequal parts, it is certainly absurd to endeavor to maintain that the parts can in any sense be equal to one another, and much more so that they can be one and the same thing with the whole. We are taught in the Trinity that the Godhead is constituted of three parts—the Father, who is God; the Son, who is Christ; and the Holy Ghost. All of these being equal, yet unequal, are united in a God, to whom they are each individually equal. If this were incomprehensible only, I might believe in it, but as, according to my light, it is also directly impossible, I must reject it. Surely when we dwell with our minds upon the future life and upon the attributes of the Almighty we "shake our dispositions with thoughts beyond the reaches of our souls" enough, without racking our reasons with the vain endeavor at the reconciliation of doctrines which are in themselves irreconcilable. And may we not question the authority of any finite being or set of finite beings to draw up articles of faith defining the constitution of the Infinite God, and then to declare that all men must believe or risk the salvation of their souls?

That God and man are one, and that "Christ and His people are one," according to the sense of my own interpretation of the Gospels, I can well believe. That faith is, indeed, the foundation of my somewhat simple religion. But the incomprehensible manner in which Christ is apparently exalted above God into the chief object of Christian adoration, in Article X. of our Modern Minister, is to me a kind of pious sacrilege, and is not in accordance with the devotional instincts which bend the knee in worship to the One Great God of the Universe.

A LAYMAN.

### OBSTRUCTING BROADWAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ROUND TABLE:

SIR: Many people will thank you if you will continue to protest against the obstruction nuisance in Broadway. I have seen something of European cities, and think you quite right in saying that what we submit to here, of this nature, would not be tolerated there. My home is on Staten Island, and three times within a month I have missed the boat, and been obliged to kick my heels in the cold for an hour, because my omnibus was stopped by the jam of express wagons. These wagons have no business, except that of mere transit, on a thoroughfare like Broadway. They should be on Washington, Pearl, or West Street, or, what would perhaps be better, be located



together on Battery Place. The ostentation of doing a "big" business is about all the expressmen gain by their Broadway depots—thousands of people are daily subjected to great inconvenience by them, for which there is no possible compensation—and the sooner they are all cleared out the better for the public at large.

Yours, etc., JOHN GILPIN.  
EXCHANGE PLACE, NEW YORK, November 17, 1868.

## REVIEWS.

All books designed for review in THE ROUND TABLE must be sent to this office.

## KOCH'S HISTORICAL GRAMMAR OF ENGLISH.\*

IT is delightful to turn from the miserable compends called English grammars which are published and used in this country to a work of real learning and solid science, like the one now before us. In a series of articles which we published some time ago (*German Works on English*, Nos. 147, 148, 150) we noticed the first and second volumes in very commendatory terms, and we have now to call attention to the recently published first part of the third, which treats of the etymology of the "Saxon and other Germanic elements" of our language.

The science of language, the most recent of the sciences, has of late years made such progress as no branch of knowledge ever did before. What an immense distance lies between the etymologists of our day and the stand-point of men like Damm, the author of the valuable *Lexicon Homericum*, who could, in all sober seriousness, give as the etymology of *δόμος*, *δῶρον* and *πῶλον*, because it was the meal taken at the time of ceasing from the spear! Thanks to Hindoo, English, and German scholars, we have arrived at a far more thorough understanding of the nature of language and of its connection with thought. There is no danger of the human intellect's being ever again mastered by superstitious reverence for a mere word; the "demon of analysis" has forbidden that for all time. We have at last penetrated into the mint where the pure elements of thought are alloyed and coined, and we now know that each word expressing a complex of thought can, by analysis, be made to give up its elements, and thereby to demonstrate the laws according to which we think. It is fine fun to laugh at the German philosophers with their subject and object, their *ego* and *non-ego*; but it is better fun to watch how the jesters in every word with which they jest confirm these very distinctions.

Let those who would limit the acts of reason to the sphere of consciousness take note of this one fact, that in the structure of language we behold the most magnificent work of reason constructed, without conscious aim, by thousands and thousands of individual minds acting in concert. It is a remarkable fact that the most synthetic and complicated languages are those in use among people in whom the conscious part of reason is most slenderly developed, and that language becomes more and more analytic in proportion as consciousness becomes clearer. It is consciousness manifestly that breaks the unity of reason; to the perfect unbroken reason language would, seemingly, be an impossibility. To it each thing and fact would mean, in an equal degree, the whole universe, and for that there could be but one word—a word, however, which would be the sum of all words. That is the word which, in the depth of silence, we hear in the ringing of our ears.

The philosophy of language is an investigation of the processes of the unconscious by the conscious reason. A simple enough word, to all appearance, is *the*, and yet it is a compound whose elements the self-conscious thought can express only in words which, to the mass of people, are more unmeaning than the clumsiest terms of the jargon of chemistry. *This is ta-ya*, whereof the former part is a demonstrative expressing locality, and the latter a relative expressing at once difference and identity. Every time I say *the man*, I say in reality *man there who*, that is *man in place, partly identical with, partly different from, the general concept of man*. Did these two elements exist separately before they were combined or synthesized? Such a question has no relevancy as applied to the products of the non-self-conscious reason. For it there is nothing isolated; things are not thought out of their relations, and hence are not expressed as

out of them. The senses give us complexity; it is the conscious reflection that analyzes and gives simple concepts. The highest and most arduous objects of thought are the least complex; the lowest the most so. If mind, in its lowest stages, grasped only the most complex or concrete objects, the terms that express these ought to be correspondingly complex; and this, indeed, is what we find to be the fact. Those linguists who claim an onomatopoeic origin for language have this difficulty to explain: that the oldest languages contain the smallest number of onomatopoeic words, and that words which, in their oldest form, bear no traces of onomatopoea—*thunder*, for example—tend gradually to assume an imitative sound. But, even if it were granted that the matter of language was derived from without, from the sounds of nature, animate and inanimate, still a sound is not a word until the mind, acting through the organs of the body, has given it meaning and determination. Onomatopoea is a favorite doctrine with philologists of materialist tendencies, who try, as far as possible, to abolish the distinction between man and brute. Yet, after all, the doctrine does not help them much; for if man learns language and the brutes do not, that fact alone places man generically above the brute. A mocking-bird is a long way from being a man.

The aspects of material nature are thousand-fold, the number of compound substances is incalculable; nevertheless chemical analysis has shown that the elements of matter are comparatively few—only a little over sixty. Some of these elements exist simple in nature, the greater part are found in combination, while a few can with difficulty be kept uncombined. So it is with language—some of its nobler elements can and do exist uncombined; the greater proportion can be separated only by a process of conscious analysis, which is sometimes very difficult. It is a comparatively uninteresting question whether these elements ever existed uncombined; and it is certain that, if they did so, they did not constitute a language, any more than the uncombined elements of material substances would constitute a world. Language is not, without the combining force of thought. All progress is toward analysis.

But though the elementary sounds of language never did form a means of communication, save in combination, it is no less interesting on that account to analyze language, and thus to bring into consciousness those processes which were gone through by the mind unconsciously in the formation of speech. This is what Mr. Koch, in the volume before us, has done for the English language, or at least for that part of it which forms the groundwork of its peculiar structure; and one has only to look at his table of contents to see that he has gone to work with a thorough knowledge of the profoundest principles of language. In a short *Introduction* he explains to us the nature of a root, and of what he calls a formative element.

"Man," he says, "is conscious of the impressions which he receives through his senses from the outer world; he feels himself impelled to reproduce these impressions in sounds, and to shape them to peculiar conceptive forms. In every word, therefore, we may distinguish the intellectual content and the external setting."

"Roots either mark relations of space and the like, or they contain the substance of concepts. The content of the former is a formal one, that of the latter a material one. The former, therefore, are designated prenominal and numeral roots, the latter verbal and nominal roots. As the former are used to form word-stems from verbal roots they must be considered first."

Accordingly, in his first book he considers *Prenominal Formations*; in his second, *Numerals*; in his third, *Verb and Noun Formations*; in his fourth, *Composition*; while the fifth is devoted to the un-Saxon Germanic elements of the language—Norse, Low-German, etc.—and the sixth to onomatopoeic words (*Lautnachahmungen*).

It is apparent enough from this arrangement what view the author takes of the origin of language. That origin lies in man himself. Just as each of the lower animals expresses all that it is conscious of, namely, pleasurable or painful sensations, so man, with his higher consciousness, is endowed also with a higher and more complex means of expression. The lion does not learn his roar from the trees of the forest, nor the eagle his scream from the thunder of the clouds. Neither did man learn his speech from the brutes, whose inarticulate sound-gestures bear no resemblance to the vehicle of reason. Truly, man can imitate the sound-gestures of the brute, but where shall he copy the language of reason and reflection? From himself, or not at all. Many words of a language may bear a resemblance to external sounds; is it on that account certain that man copied them? There are few onomatopoeic words that have not synonyms of quite a different character. It

is true that men require bricks and mortar, or similar things, in order to build a house; but, after all, the bricks and mortar are not the house, and all that is in the house can exist—in the mind of the architect—as well without them as with them. Castles in the air are as gorgeous as castles on the earth. Had man not been able to think a house without having first seen one, he would never have seen one. It would be strange if all actions in the universe should have their appropriate vocal expression with the sole exception of the highest, namely, thought. No one supposes that man had to borrow the "cry for help, the tongue that all men speak;" and why? Simply because it is common to him with the lower animals. But why do the lower animals shriek when hurt? Put alongside this the question, Why do men speak their thoughts? and one answer will do for both.

Language is always the perfect reflex of thought, as necessary to thought as thought is to it. Absence of thought entails absence of language; an infinite thought would necessitate an infinite expression—and *vice versa*, if we consider well. To say that we do not know how thought transforms itself into language, is about as much as to say that we do not know how will transforms itself into action. But the fact is, we do know both processes, all that there is to be known about them; and what we do not know is something that we fancy ought to be, and is not. All that we have to do in either case is to call our latent knowledge into consciousness. Which of us can remember the process by which he learnt to write, without considerable effort? Our old copy-books are almost like a revelation to us. We learnt the art of writing from others. From whom did mankind learn it? Egypt is asked in vain.

It will be seen that Mr. Koch distinguishes between the matter or substance of language and its forms. We are not aware that there has ever been a serious attempt to trace the latter to onomatopoea, and we venture to say that onomatopoea would not explain their existence. But there have been attempts made to identify the material roots of language with certain sounds familiar to us as coming from the outer world. There is, notably, a small work by Dr. Voigtmann,\* written in reply to Max Müller's *Lectures on the Science of Language*, in which the author, by setting at defiance Grimm's law, and, indeed, all other laws, thinks he succeeds in finding the whole of language in the nut-shell of an English asseveration, *By cock and pie*. He quotes the New Testament, Pliny, and Shakespeare to show that the cock is closely related to our religious consciousness. The straits to which he and theorists like him are reduced may be seen from the following passage:

"In Shakespeare and old English writers generally, as well as occasionally in the mouths of rustics and common people at the present day, there occurs the half-serious, half-burlesque asseveration, *By cock and pie* (*eye*). In England itself there have been many conjectures, discussions, and writings on the sense of this expression; according to my impression and conviction nothing shows its real meaning better than the addition which we frequently find along with it: *By cock and pie and the mouset-foot*, in which—naturally considered—there can be nothing else but an invocation to *motive power, motive natural power*; for we observe the pie (*pica*) not only frequently nod with its head, but also at the same time swing its tail rapidly and vigorously backwards and forwards and cry *shack, shackerack*, in which there always seemed to me, even in my boyhood, in my solitary roamings through wood and glade, to be a sort of charm or incantation. So also we observe the cock turn rapidly round in a circle encompassing about, as it were, his mate, in the charm of love. In other circumstances, also, he shows himself frequently 'half on the wing' (cf. Masius, p. 54), just as the *cuculus*, *cuculus canorus*, which is closely related to him, in the spring time swings the fore part of his body up and down, which swinging stands in necessary connection with the *sound* (singing), for it is only a swinging body that sounds."

There has seldom been as much ingenuity wasted as there is in Dr. Voigtmann's little book. Indeed many passages in it would lead one to suppose that he meant the whole for a burlesque of the doings of pretentious theorists, who spin systems out of their own ill-regulated imaginations.

We think Mr. Koch is right in assigning to onomatopoea the subordinate place he does, as well as in refraining from attempting to stretch the analytic process beyond what it will bear. When we have once settled for all languages what is simple and irreducible, it will be time to inquire into the details of the origin of the elements. But much painful labor will have to be gone through before the science of language is in a condition to undertake this inquiry; meanwhile let us hold fast to attained results and beware of spoiling them by the intermixture of chimerical, premature theories. This is what Mr. Koch has done; he has simply taken the results attained by Bopp, Grimm, Pott, Schleicher, and others, and ap-

\* *Histories Grammatik der englischen Sprache*. Von C. Friedrich Koch, III. Band. I. Theil: Die Wortbildung. Cassel und Göttingen: Georg H. Wigand; New York: L. W. Schmidt. 1868.

\* Dr. Max Müller's *Bau und Theorie und der Ursprung der Sprache*. Ein Wort zur Verständigung an den Herausgeber der *Verhandlungen über die Wissenschaft der Sprache*. Von Dr. Christoph Gottl. Voigtmann. Leipzig: Verlag von Bernhard Schlicke. 1865.



plied them in detail to the English language. When he has finished his grammar, it will not cost him much trouble to follow it up with an etymological dictionary, which need be nothing more than an alphabetic arrangement of the articles in his grammar. Or he may, with advantage, hand it over to Grein to be incorporated in the next edition of the latter's *Sprachschatz der angelsächsischen Dichter*.

It is difficult to choose a passage from this book which shall give an adequate idea of the exhaustiveness with which the whole subject is treated. We select the article on *Demonstrative Pronouns*, simply on account of its brevity:

"§ 9. The demonstrative, which in the Germanic languages dwindle down into an article, is present in the Sanskrit *ta* (he, this, that). In the nominative, masculine and feminine, *i* is softened to *ta*, and the nominative sign of the masculine is dropped, hence *sa*, *ta*, *ta-t*, and the corresponding Gothic *sa*, *ta*, *ta-t*; Old-Saxon *se*, *þu*, *þu*, *þat*; Anglo-Saxon, *se*, *sed*, *þæt*; Old-Friesian, *þi*, *þin*, *þet*; Semi-Saxon, *þe*, *þeo*, *þa*, *þæt*; Old-English, *þæt*, *þat*, and *þe*; New-English, *that*, article, *that*, pronoun. (See Vol. I., *Inflection*, § 165; II., 181-193, 328, etc.)

"A stronger pronoun is formed from *ta* and the relative stem *ya*, thus *ta-ya*, *ta-ya*, and hence *ta-ya-t*, *ta-ya-t* (this); Old High-German, *d-er*, *din*, *d-a-t*. This is, perhaps, still present in the abraded forms of the Anglo-Saxon *þe*, *þin*, *þæt* (*vide supra*).

"For emphasis *sa* the demonstrative is again prefixed, Sansk., *ta-ya-t*, *ta-ya-t*, *ta-ya-t* (this); Old High-Ger., *d-er*, *d-er*, *d-er*, *d-er*, *d-er*, *d-er*; Old-Sax., *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*; Anglo-Saxon, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*; Old-Friesian, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*; Semi-Sax., *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*; Old-Eng., *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*, *þe-se*; New-Eng., *this*. (See Vol. I., *Inflection*, § 166; II., 330.)

"§ 10. The demonstrative that points to the distance seems likewise to consist of three elements, the relative *ya*, the demonstrative *i*, and the negative particle. Hence *ya-i-na-s* = this not, *i*, *e*, that; Greek *καί-τι-πο-ς*, Gothic *jain(a)-s*, *jain(a)-ta*; Old High-Ger., *gēn-er*, *gēn-er*, *gēn-er*, *gēn-er*, *gēn-er*, *gēn-er*; Anglo-Saxon has only the adverbial *gēn-d* (yonder), which, however, is used by Orm as a pronoun and maintains itself; Old-Eng., *yon*, *yonne*, *yond*, *yonder*; New-Eng., *yon*, *yon-d*, *yon-d-er*. (See Vol. I., *Inflection*, §§ 170, 335.)

"§ 11. The Sanskrit adjective *sama-s* (like, similar) is in Gothic *sama-n* (the same), and Old-Norse (*sami*) a pronoun, whereas Old-Saxon and Anglo-Saxon have only the adverbial *sama*, *same*, *saman* (together, at once). Probably the adverbial use was resuscitated by the Old-Norse, inasmuch as *þe same* occurs first in Semi-Saxon in the *Ormulum* and *Langtoft's Chronicle*. In Middle-English it expands to *the (that, this) same*; New-Eng., *the (that, this, yonder) same*, *the self-same*, *the very self-same*. (See Vol. I., *Inflection*, § 169; II., 336.)

"§ 12. The Gothic *silba* Grimm separates into the reflexive *si* (me) and the Gothic *leiba* (to remain), and explains it as the in itself remaining or abiding. For the second element we may imagine a substantive, as Old High-Ger. *lip* (body), therefore Gothic *leib-s*, the same body. Old High-Ger., *selb-er* and *selb-er*; Old-Saxon, *selbo*, *selb*; Old-Fries., *self*, *selva*; Anglo-Sax., *self*, *self*, *self*, *self*, *self*, *self*; Semi-Sax., *self*, *self*, *self*, *self*, *self*, *self*; Layamon, *self* Orm; Old-Eng., *self*, *selue*, *seluen*, etc., *Langtoft's Chronicle*; New-English, *self*, *selves*. (See Vol. I., *Inflection*, § 168; II., 334.)

"§ 13. From the instrumental case *þ* of the demonstrative stem, or from this stem itself, there is formed, in conjunction with *lic* (Gothic *leik-s*, like), *þ-lic*, *þ-lic*, *þ-lic*, which occurs only in combination with *se*: *se þ-lic-a*, *sed þ-lic*, *þæt þ-lic* (the same); Semi-Sax., *þe ilke*, *þis ilke*; Old-Eng., *þat ilke*, *þis ilke*, *þis ilke*; Middle-Eng., *the ilke*, *that ilke*, *this ilke*; New-Eng., *like* in Spenser, and in Scottish *ilk*. (See Vol. II., § 331.)

"So likewise from the instrumental *þ*, *þ* (St. *sa*), *þ-lic*, *þ-lic*, *þ-lic* (such); Semi-Sax., *thilke*, *thilke*, *thilke*; Old-Eng., *thilke* in Robert of Gloucester; New-Eng., still in dialects; *thilke* Glouc., *thuck*, *thek*, *thik*, etc., and in Spenser. (See Vol. II., § 332; I., *Inflection*, § 167.)

"By the side of the Gothic *selb-leik-s*, formed from the instrumental *selb*, stands the Old-Sax. *selik*; Old High-Ger., *selik*; Old-Fries., *selik*, *selik*; Anglo-Sax., *swile*, *swyle*, *swile* (such); Semi-Sax., *swile*, *swile*, *swile*; Old-Eng., *swilich*, *swilich*, *swilich*; Middle-Eng., *swiche*, *swiche*, *swiche*, *swiche*, *swiche*, *swiche*; New-Eng., such, dialects *sich*, *seck*, etc. (See Vol. I., *Inflection*, § 167; II., 333.)

Among pronominal formations Mr. Koch treats prepositions, conjunctions, and determinative adjectives and adverbs, that is, he carries out consistently the distinction between formative and material elements. An entire book is devoted to numeral adverbs and adjectives, which are shown to spring from the same roots as the personal pronouns, and to have, in a measure, the same office. In the first volume of his grammar, where he treats of inflexion or accidence, he takes up and discusses nouns, adjectives, and verbs, before he proceeds to pronouns and numerals. In the second volume, which treats of syntax, the same order is adopted, and the indeclinable elements of the language are discussed last. The reason for the arrangement in the latter case is very plain, inasmuch as the simplest elements of the sentence are subject and predicate, noun or pronoun, and verb. But why, in treating of accidence, the determined should precede the determining elements, we do not see. We think, when Mr. Koch publishes a new and complete edition of his grammar, he will do well to insert the whole of his third volume before his accidence, and to arrange the latter in the same order as the contents of the former; thus a good deal of the accidence might be dispensed with altogether.

In treating of verb and noun formations the author puts the relations of space before those of time, that is, nouns before verbs, making only the exception of what are called strong verbs. The reason for this arrange-

ment no doubt is, that in the conjugation of strong verbs there takes place a change—a weakening or strengthening—of root, and the same change is apparent in the stems of nouns, while in the conjugation of weak verbs the stem, which need not be a simple root, remains throughout unchanged. The section on strong verbs is very short, we suppose because they are treated exhaustively in the first volume. Noun formations are arranged according to suffixes, these being *a*, *i*, *u*, *ja*, *an*, *as*, *la*, and *ra*, *va*, *na*, *nta*, *māna*, *ma*, *ka*, *ta*, *tar*; so also are weak verbs. In treating of all these Mr. Koch never forgets for a moment that he is writing an historical grammar; but, after having determined the original form of each word, traces it down to its present or final form.

Composition our author defines as "the combination of two [why not more?] words which can exist separately, for the designation of a concept." On the principle that the last element determines the class to which the compound belongs, he divides compounds into two classes, viz., substantives and adjectives. He devotes a section to a peculiar kind of composition, which he calls application (*Anlehnung*), and which consists in the gradual merging together of a governed case with a following governing one. Examples are *Wōdnes-daeg* (Wednesday), *dōmes-daeg* (doomsday), *daeges-edge* (day's eye, daisy), etc., etc.

The book devoted to the un-Saxon Germanic elements of English is highly interesting. Mr. Koch finds in the English language, viewed in the whole extent of its history, 139 words of Scandinavian origin directly introduced, whereof 71 are nouns, 16 adjectives, 45 verbs, six adverbs, and one a conjunction. Of these there exist in the current language of to-day 104, namely 59 nouns, 11 adjectives, 28 verbs, and six adverbs. As the amount of Scandinavian influence on the English language is generally greatly underestimated, we will give the entire list of these, and it will be seen from their familiarity and necessity how deep and pervading that influence must have been.

The nouns are *bag*, *bole*, *booty*, *brag*, *bring*, *bull*, *pole-ax*, *buttock*, *dairy*, *earl*, *fell*, *fellow*, *fool*, *froth*, *gable*, *gaby* (?), *gill*, *growth*, *gin*, *hustings*, *leap-year*, *neaf* (? fist), *cake*, *keg*, *kid*, *cross*, *crook*, *cripple*, *leg*, *muck*, *odds*, *puck*, *rump*, *ruck*, *root*, *scald* (poet), *skellum*, *skull* (and *scull*), *skill*, *skid*, *sky*, *shaw*, *screw*, *sleeve*, *shirt* (skirt?), *sledge* (sleigh?), *sleight*, *stag*, *stack*, *tike* (and *tick*), *tarn*, *thrump*, *uproar*, *wapentake*, *window*, *windlass*; adjectives, *blunt*, *dull*, *fond*, *low*, *niggard*, *scant*, *sly*, *sleek*, *snug*, *soggy*, *trusty*; verbs, *bang*, *bask*, *bellow*, *dash*, *dose* (*daze*, *dazzle*), *die*, *droop*, *dub*, *flit*, *grovel*, *hale*, *hit*, *cast*, *clip*, *cuff*, *curl*, *cut*, *kindle*, *lurk*, *mump* (mumble, mumps?), *ransack*, *scrub*, *sculk*, *spell*, *stagger*, *stifle*, *thrive*; adverbs, *abroad*, *agate* (?), *askew*, *aslant*, *aback*, *athwart*. To these Mr. Koch might have added, we think, several others, such as *billow*, *clumsy*, *force* (=waterfall), *midden* (used by Sir Charles Lyell), *meek* (which our author himself mentions in his first volume, p. 11, last line), and several others. Mr. Koch should certainly have been omitted. It occurs in the 8th verse of the 82d Psalm, in the Anglo-Saxon version: *vurdan þā earne corðan ið meobæ* (they became as dung for the earth, Ps. 83, 10, English version). Possibly a reference to Grein's *Sprachschatz* might show that several others had representatives in Anglo-Saxon.

At first sight it should seem that one hundred and thirty-nine is a very small number of words, but when we reflect that these include only those which are peculiar to Scandinavian, whereas the number of words which Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian have in common would amount to several thousands, and that it would probably be impossible to find one hundred and thirty-nine words existing in Anglo-Saxon and not in Scandinavian, we are obliged to change our minds. When, moreover, we remember that Scandinavian influence penetrated even into the substantive verb—the forms *art* and *are* are Danish,—replaced the Saxon *a-ſ* in the plural of the pres. indic. act. by *-enn* (*-en*), and the Saxon genitive by *of* with the accusative, we cannot avoid the conclusion that Old-Norse has as good a claim to be called the parent of modern English as Anglo-Saxon has. In glancing over the above list, particularly the adjectives and verbs, one cannot help observing that the majority of them are words expressive of contempt; e. g., *blunt*, *dull*, *low*, *niggard*, *scant*, *sly*, *sleek*, *snug*, *soggy*; *bang*, *bask*, *bellow*, *dash*, *dose*, *dub*, *grovel*, *hit*, *cuff*, *mumble*, *scrub*, *sculk*, *stagger*. Who can doubt that the conquering, the superior, race were the Danes? There can be but little question that they were the ruling people over the larger portion of the island of Great Britain at and before the period of the Conquest. In Scotland, particularly, Danish influence must have been very great, greater

than even that of the Saxons. There are thousands of words in use in Scotland to-day which have no representatives in English, but which can easily be identified with words in Icelandic or Danish. A noteworthy proof of the influence of Scandinavian upon the formation of English is the fact that the strongly Danish dialect of the Scottish Barbour approaches modern English much more closely than that of his younger English contemporaries, Chaucer and Gower.

Of Low-German words Mr. Koch finds the number in English to be thirty-nine, namely, twenty-two nouns, six adjectives, and eleven verbs. These are *band-dog*, *boy*, *brandy* (*brand-wine*), *doit*, *oast*, *gulp*, *cur*, *cudgel*, *nod* (*noddle*), *lit-mus*, *loof* (*luff*), *mud* (*muddle*), *nag*, *boker* (*poke*), *brank*, *ream*, *sloven*, *slut*, *snuff* (*snuffle*), *sprat*, *sutler*; *brakish*, *boisterous*, *dapper*, *slender*, *squint*, *frollick*; *dote*, *botch*, *guess* (?), *glib*, *cruise*, *loiter*, *muffle*, *ogle*, *ravel*, *ruffle* (*ruff*, *rivel*), *scamper*. High-German words are few, namely, *loafer* (*loaf*), *land-grave*, *rummer*, *shock* (of sheaves), *waltz*. The number of Germanic (*i. e.*, Gothic, Norse, Danish, Old and Middle High-German, Frankish, etc.) words that have come to us through the medium of French is very considerable. Of nouns, substantive and adjective, Mr. Koch gives us the following: *ambassador*, *baldric*, *balcony*, *baron*, *bawd*, *bivouac*, *belfry*, *breach* (*wreck*), *bush* (*ambush*), *champion*, *chamberlain*, *quiver*, *dance*, *towel*, *fief* (*feoff* and *enfeoff*), *hauberk* (*habergeon*), *arquebuss*, *hamlet*, *haste* (noun and verb), *harbor* (n. and v.), *harbinger*, *herald*, *ribald*, *harangue* (*ring-leader*), *rank*, *range*, *lansquenet*, *marshal*, *march*, *poke* (*pocket*), *pouch*, *poach*, *carcanet*, *robe*, *rob*, *seneschal*, *slate*, *slave*, *targe* (*target*), *attire* (n. and v.), *wait*, *ward* (and *guard*, n. and v.), *war*, *wicket*, *guerdon* (*reguerdon*, *reward*), *guile*, *wimple*, *guise* (*disguise*). Of verbs we have *afraid* (partic.), *brandish*, *seize*, *bruise*, *grate*, *flatter*, *defile*, *gallop*, *aghast* (partic.), *haunt*, *lecher*, *massacre*, *rifle*, *roast*, *eschew*, *cry*, *enamel*, *spy*, *tiff*, *attack* (*attack*), *tire*, *tumble*, *turn*, *garnish*, *gaze* (*wage*). The etymology of several of these words might with good reason be questioned, as, for example, that of *baron*, to which M. Littré has devoted several pages in his *Histoire de la Langue Française*, Tom. I., pp. 70, sqq. Mr. Koch accepts the etymology of Diez (see *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der romanischen Sprachen*, p. 45, sq.) *Balcony*, which is generally derived from Persian (see Wedgwood's *Dictionary of English Etymology*, p. 97, Vol. I.). Mr. Koch traces back to the Old-Norse *bálkr*, a partition; Old High-Ger. *palcho*, a beam; mediæval Latin *balco*, a platform; French *balcon*. *Massacre* he derives from German *metzeln* (O. H.-G. *metzalōn*). Is the word *hazian* (German *hetzen*, French *agacer*), from which he derives *agast*, the source of our college word *haze*?

Our author's remarks on *Onomatopœia*, to which Book VI. is devoted, are worth quoting:

"There is a small group of words which cannot be traced back to roots, and which do not develop themselves according to the regular known law of sounds. They appear as imitations or copies of sounds which proceed from living beings, or are produced by inanimate objects.

"A thorough treatment of these would require to be based upon natural science, which would have to show, for example, in regard to the animals, the regions in which they live. Within such a region the organism of the animal will develop itself in different ways, here to its fullest extent, there more slenderly, while toward the limits of the region deterioration will appear. The sound produced by the animal stands in the closest connection with the organism; the stronger the organism, the stronger the tones. The *ass* in Italy is said to have much better organs of sound than in our country, and accordingly his performances are said to be more considerable there. But if the sound is different, the imitation also must be different.

"A thorough treatment would, moreover, have to take into account the peculiarity of the different languages, for, by reason of them, one and the same sound would be produced in different ways. In this manner is explained the difference of designations, which are undoubtedly intended to reproduce the cry of an animal. For example, the cuckoo is called in Sanskrit *kūkūla*, Greek *kōkku*, Latin *cucul-us*, French *coucou*, Old-French *coucou*, German *Kuckuck*, Dutch *koekoek*, Danish *kuk*; cf. Old High-Ger. *gouch*, Middle H.-G. *gouch*, New-H.-G. *Gauch*, Anglo-Sax. *gēac*, Wright 2, 4, Middle-Eng. *cucko* 13, *cuckoo* 14, *cokow* 15, Old-Norse *gāuk-r*, Danish *gjøg*."

We have noticed a good many misprints in the book and here and there a false reference; e. g., p. 6, line 5, for 175 read 165; p. 143, line 9, for *bul* read *bull*; p. 160, line 18, for *attache* read *attach*, etc., etc. These, however, are mere spots in the sun, and we heartily recommend Mr. Koch's work to the notice of American scholars. We hope he will soon favor us with the remainder of the third volume, and thereafter with as many more volumes as he can find material for. We had thought the work was closed with the second volume; but having been agreeably disappointed to find we were wrong, we will not undertake to say how many volumes there may yet be in store for us.\*

\*German books noticed in *The Round Table* are received from L. W. Schmidt, 24 Barclay Street, New York.



## ALCOTT'S TABLETS.\*

## III.

THE speculative portion of this book will cause much perplexity, for the reason that it requires a peculiar alertness on the part of the reader in the art of reading between the lines, since more lies in the connection which seemingly detached passages have than in the direct sense of the words and sentences. Just as Goethe in his *Faust*, or Tennyson in his *Maud*, portrays a dramatic action by letting the reader see a reflection of the act in the mind of the personage who speaks, so, too, philosophy of the highest order of insight may be portrayed by giving here and there a bold stroke and letting the thoughtful student supply the full outline which belongs to it. Winckelmann's remarks upon the torso illustrate how completely this may be done. But it is this habit that gives the mystic character to Mr. Alcott's writings—the literal sense only being seized by the reader, and the far-off, implied, meaning either entirely missed or but faintly surmised.

Stated compendiously, the contents of this part of the book are: I. *Instrumentalities*—The world of nature and man regarded as means to the highest end. II. *Mind*—The end itself regarded as culminating in person. III. *Genesis*—How the world of nature and man is in all its stages a process toward that end. IV. *Metamorphoses*—The phases of life regarded as founded on a substantial unity with that end.

If Mr. Alcott seemed a little hostile to the prevailing spirit of the age when he conducted us through his *Garden*, here, at least, he does full justice to it. We have at the commencement a statement in its broadest significance of the "tendency" to make and invent useful things. Mechanic invention is seen as the instrument by which combination is effected and the weak made equal to the strong. Intelligence gets diffused and riches become instrumental in the service of the humanities.

But we are not building materially without at the same time recognizing therein the symbols of spirit. The material progress is only a shadow of the spiritual revolution which has gone on. Spirit will have symbols of itself, hence it has created these external forms. So in the world of pure thought:

"The new calculus is ours. An organon alike serviceable to metaphysician and naturalist—whereby things answer to thought, facts are resolved into truths, images into ideas, matter into mind, power into personality, man into God; the One soul in all souls revealed as the Creative Spirit pulsating in all breasts, immanent in all atoms, prompting all wills, and personally embracing all persons in one unbroken synthesis of Being."

According to the materialist, the world is inverted and the self-sufficient depends upon the dependent. But the idealist seizes the highest type first and explains all below from it.

Man, as an instrument, is self-end; hence he is the instrument of the creation, the "Demiurgus."

"He omnipresent is,  
All round himself he lies,  
Osiris spread abroad,  
Upstaring in all eyes:  
Nature his globed thought,  
Without him she were not,  
Cosmos from chaos were not spoken,  
And God bereft of visible token."

He is the microcosm, and reaches from the center to the circumference. "A theometer—instrument of instruments;" for man's highest end is to realize in himself the divine.

Having thus treated of the *means* we come to the *end* in the chapter on *Mind*, which he treats under four topics: *Ideas*, *The Gifts*, *Person*, *Choice*. Ideas are the constants in the fleeting show of time. We seize the general and abiding, while the special comes and goes:

"Thought is the Mercury; and things are caught on the wing, and by the flying spectator only. Nature is thought in solution. Like a river whose current is flowing steadily, drop displacing drop, particle following particle of the passing stream, nothing abides but the spectacle. So the flowing world is fashioned in the idealist's vision, and is the reality which to slower wits seems fixed in space and apart from thought, subsisting in itself. But thought works in the changing and becoming, not in the changed and become: all things sliding by imperceptible gradations into their contraries, the cosmos rising out of the chaos by its agency. Nothing abides; all is image and expression out of our thought."

The idealist holds things for phenomenal, and is thus the true realist, inasmuch as he seizes them in their reality and is not deceived. This does not mean that man as an animal creates matter, but that it is the alchemy of mind that does this—a dogma held by all believers in St. John's Gospel.

Thus, too, the mind receives only creatively, paradoxical as this may seem. Aristotle beautifully expresses it—*ἐκ φύσεως*; and the reader of Mr. Alcott's book will realize that very little is to be got from it

passively, but that he can profit by it only through his own intense activity.

"Thought's winged hand,  
Marshals in trope and tone  
The ideal band.  
Genius alone  
Holds fast in eye  
The fleeing God—  
Brings Beauty nigh—  
Senses descry  
Footsteps He trod,  
Figures He drew,  
Shapes old and new,  
The fair, the true,  
In soul and sod."

"Nature is thought immersed in matter, and seen differently as viewed from the one or the other. To the laborer it is a thing of mere uses; to the scholar a symbol and a muse. The same landscape is not the same as seen by poet and ploughman. It stands for material benefit to the one, immaterial to the other."

Let him, then, take heed how he sees. Ideas are total forms; hence any dependent being regarded in its entire extent will involve other beings and therewith form one unity, which is the idea; hence he says:

"Ideas alone supplement nature and complement mind. Our senses neither satisfy our sensibility nor intellect. The mind's objects are mind itself; imagination the mind's eye, memory the ear, ideas of the one imaging the other, and the mind thus rounding its history. And hence the pleasurable perspective experienced in surveying our personality from obverse sides in the landscape of existence—culture, in its inclusive sense, making the tour of our gifts, and acquainting us with ourselves and the world we live in. All men gain a residence in the senses and the family of natural things; few come into possession of their better inheritance and home in the mind—the Palace of Power and Personality. Sons of earth rather by preference, and chiefly emulous for their little while of its occupancy, its honors, emoluments, they here pitch their tents, here plant fast their hopes, and roll through life they know not whither."

What are *The Gifts*? one will ask on arriving at this obscure chapter. They are the talents which measure the escape from "the abyss." The rudimentary form is instinct—mere organic unity; then comes *sense*, and after it *memory*, and thus on through *understanding*, *fancy*, *reason*, *imagination*, *conscience*, and finally culminating in the *will*. Thus we have a scale of ascent from the lowest to the highest and most complete form of self-determination. The ascent to person through the hierarchy of gifts is a slow process:

"Long for the individual, longeval for the race. Centuries, millenniums elapse, mind meanwhile travelling with man, the birth arrested for the most part, or premature, the translation from germ to genius being supernatural, thought hardly delivered from spine and occiput into face and forehead, the mind uplifted and crowned in personality."

In treating of the *Person* and *Choice* Mr. Alcott displays the serenest height of his speculation; it is here that he equals Kapila in the demand for freedom from the root of egotism—the categories of the understanding. But he surpasses Kapila in that his fine discrimination saves the ego as person, while it sacrifices the same as brittle individualism—Kapila being obliged to destroy both.

"Nor, considering the demands mind makes upon the senses—these inclining always to idolatry—is it surprising that this spiritual theism, seeking its symbols in pure thought, without image graven or conceived, should find any considerable number of followers? Yet a faith less supersensuous and ideal, any school of thought, code of doctrine, creed founded on substance, force, law, tradition, authority, miracle, is a covert superstition, ending logically in atheism, necessity, nihilism, disowning alike personality, free agency."

*Choice*, the attribute of personality, is the key alike to the pit and to the abode of the blest, and hence the high place Mr. Alcott assigns to it.

In the chapter headed *Genesis* we have the subtle doctrine of correspondence unfolded in the sections entitled *Vestiges*, *Serpent Symbol*, *Embryons*, and *Temperament*. Thus we have the origin discussed under *Vestiges*: Man is prior to nature—a mystic statement for the doctrine that mind or thought is the prior condition of matter and nature. The final cause to which all aspire is the free intelligence, and hence we find all lower creatures exhibiting traces of man, and hence too we have *correspondences*. But we have a deeper doctrine which gives us the same result, namely, that all imperfect beings are through the lapse of man. For as man perceives partially and analytically he takes objects out of their true relations, and hence creates evil, for to the one who sees all things in their true relations there can be no such thing as evil.

The serpent symbol—pointing to the mysteries of sex, the symbol of the generic entity, hence denoting divine wisdom and also eternity—is a natural correspondence found everywhere among primitive people.

The generic becomes real in the embryo, and mounts thence

"Through all the spires of form."

But temperament is a fate which opposes the course of development with more or less effect. It is the mortgage of nature upon spirit, and no one wholly escapes it. There is, however, comfort for all:

"Yet, biased by temperament as we may be, whether for good or for evil, such measure of freedom is ours, nevertheless, as enables us to

free ourselves from its tendencies and temptations. In the breast of each is a liberating angel, at whose touch, when we will it persistently, the doors of our dungeon fly open and loose their prisoner."

Finally, we open the book at the last chapter, and meet the strange-sounding inscription from Hermes Trismegistus at the portal:

"Generation is not a creation of life, but a production of things to sense, and making them manifest. Neither is change death, but a hiding of that which was."

The *Metamorphoses* which transpire in spiritual life are treated under the topics of *Sleep*, *Reminiscences*, and *Immortality*.

Sleep is the recurrence of embryonic life—a sort of return to pre-existence. Reminiscence is the thread by which we hold to our former selves—i. e., preserve the continuity which makes us personal beings:

"Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting;  
The soul that rises with us, our life's star,  
Hath had elsewhere its setting,  
And cometh from afar;  
Not in entire forgetfulness,  
Nor yet in utter nakedness,  
But trailing clouds of glory do we come  
From God who is our home."

"None of us remember when we did not remember, when memory was nought and ourselves were unborn. Memory is the premise of our sensations, it dates our immortality. Nestling ever in the twilight of our earliest recollections, it cradles our nativity, canopies our hopes, and bears us babes, out of our bodies as into them; opening vistas alike into our past and coming existence. The thread of our experiences, it cannot be severed by any accidents of our mortality; time and space, earliest found and last to leave us, fading and falling away as we pass into recollections which these can neither date nor confine—the smiles that welcomed, the tears that dismissed us, being of no age nor place nor time."

"Memory is the premise of our sensations, it dates our immortality;" i. e., we cannot perceive sensations except actively, we presuppose the original intelligibles of the mind in every sensation, and these are said to be *reminiscences* of our pre-existence in the Platonic form of expression.

Immortality is our true life:

"Tis not our bodies that contain us, but our souls. None beholds with bodily eyes the apparition of his person, sees and survives the ghost he provokes."

Desire is the feeling of unity with that which lies outside of and beyond one's immediate being:

"Moreover, the insatiableness of our desires asserts our personal imperishableness. Yearning for full satisfactions while balked of these perpetually, we still prosecute our search for them, our faith in their attainment remaining unshaken under every disappointment. Our hope is eternal as ourselves—a never ending, still beginning, quest of our divinity. Infinite in essence, we crave it in potency."

"Take this, my child," the father said,  
'This globe I give thy mind for bread';  
Eager we seize the proffered store,  
The bait devour—then ask for more."

"Everything aspires to its own perfection and is restless till it attain it, as the trembling needle till it find its beloved north. And the knowledge of this is innate as is the desire, else the last had been a torment and needless importunity. Nature shoots not at rovers. Even inanimate things, while ignorant of their perfection, are carried toward it by a blind impulse. But that which conducts them knows. The next order of beings have some sight of it, and man most perfectly till he touch the apple. Our delights suckle us life-long, our desires being memories of past satisfactions, and we here but sip pleasures once tasted to satiety."

"Our desires being memories of past satisfactions," i. e., a feeling of unity with our totality which is the macrocosm itself. What can be more natural than the thought that the part must be posterior to the whole? That the separation must be preceded by the union? Therefore that desire must be preceded by a union with that which is desired; for how can one desire what he does not in any wise know?

For Mr. Alcott, therefore, man's nature is a rich book, out of whose trivial accidents, indeed, he reads the sublime character of its destiny.

In conclusion, we would not omit to allude to the composition of the book, made up as it is largely of quotations which, though excellent for the most part, yet are far surpassed by what is original, especially by the original poetry, such as *The Goblet*, *The Seer's Rations*, *The Chase*, *Omnipresence*, and others. It will require a close and meditative reading, often repeated, to get the best the book contains, but this is true of every book. Its influence is thoroughly sound and healthy, building up hope and earnestness in the human breast. His peroration:

"Still heaven is, our hearts affirm against every disappointment; and whether behind or before us, as memory or as hope, 'tis to be ours,—our port and resting place some time in the stream of ages."

## LIBRARY TABLE.

**THE PAMPAS AND ANDES: A Thousand Miles' Walk across South America.** By Nathaniel N. Bishop. With an introduction by Edward A. Samuels. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1868.—The best explanation of this book is contained in a quotation inserted by Mr. Samuels in his introduction, a passage from a letter printed in *The Boston Advertiser*:

"VALPARAISO, November 27, 1855."

"There arrived here, a few days since, a young man belonging to Medford, Mass., who has walked across the Pampas and Cordilleras, more than a thousand miles, unable to speak the language, and with an astonishingly small amount of money."

"So much for a Yankee."

\* Tablets. By A. Bronson Alcott. Boston: Roberts Bros. 1868.



At the time of performing this feat, Mr. Samuels adds, Mr. Bishop was but seventeen years old, and while he left home for the journey of twelve thousand miles, of which his transcontinental walk formed a part, with but \$45, he returned home with \$50. This he managed by sailing from Boston for Buenos Ayres, before the mast, on a vessel for whose peculiar sea-going qualities he accounts on the score that her kind are built, in the state of Maine, by the mile, and sawed off in lengths to suit purchasers. His walk was taken in company with a caravan, made up entirely of people whose language he could not speak. These, with but two exceptions, were peculiarly infamous in character, swindling and abusing him in every manner, and, especially, attempting to dispose of him by poison in order to get possession of the money they knew to be about his person. By dint of shrewdness and vigilance, however, and by the friendship he maintained with an Indian woman, the only female in the party,—our author's facility in gaining the favor of the sex on every occasion seems to have been remarkable,—he reached the Andes in safety, and thence pursued his journey in more congenial company to Valparaiso, on the Pacific coast. Apart from the novelty of the trip and the pluck and hardihood of the young pedestrian, there is much that is interesting, amusing, and instructive in his observations on the regions and people among which he passed. On the alert for everything noteworthy, Mr. Bishop was especially observant of natural phenomena and facts in zoölogy and ornithology, in the latter of which he seems particularly well read. His style, though by no means faultless, is so simple, clear, and unpretentious, and the writer's modesty, self-reliance, and good-temper are such that adverse criticism would be difficult, even if it were needed. But the book is one which we shall insure our readers' approval by recommending to them.

*Historical Account of Bouquet's Expedition against the Ohio Indians, in 1764. With Preface by Francis Parkman, and a translation of Dumas' Biographical Sketch of General Bouquet. [An Historical Account of the Expedition against the Ohio Indians, in the year MDCCLXIV, under the command of Henry Bouquet, Esq., Colonel of Foot, and now Brigadier-General in America. Including his Transactions with the Indians, Relative to the Delivery of their Prisoners, And the Preliminaries of Peace. With an introductory account of the Preceding Campaign, And Battle at Bushy Run. To which are annexed Military Papers, containing Reflections on the War with the Savages; a Method of forming Frontier Settlements; some Account of the Indian Country; with a List of Nations, Fighting Men, Towns, Distances, and different Routes. The whole illustrated with a Map and Copper-Plates. Published from authentic Documents, by a Lover of his Country. Philadelphia, Printed: London, Reprinted for T. Jefferies, Geographer to his Majesty, at Charing Cross. MDCCLXVI.] Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1868.*—A better initial volume to the *Ohio Valley Historical Series* could not be desired than this. Everything is in its favor—the beauty of the volume itself, an invariable characteristic of whatever leaves its publishers' press; the rarity of the work reprinted (the one whose long title is given in brackets in the caption to this notice), although its appearance in Philadelphia in 1765 was followed by its republication in London the next year, and, in a French translation, in Amsterdam in 1769; the importance in the history of our ante-Revolutionary colonizations of the events which occasioned the expedition; and, by no means least, the brief explanatory preface added by Mr. Francis Parkman. The book is one which, in a remarkable degree, *crescit eundo*, the original narrative forming little more than a third of the volume, which is filled by various accretions—appendices, the memoir of the accomplished officer who led the expedition, the various military papers described in the title, all of which throw a curious and interesting light on early frontier life and the difficulties with which the pioneers had to grapple. The occasion of the expedition is told in few words by Mr. Parkman, than whom few know more about the Indians and their wars, and whom none has approached in recounting them. The peace of 1763 between France and England gave to the latter the vast Indian territories in which the French had made themselves, on the whole, liked, the English detested; instead, therefore, of forwarding the settlements, establishing their rule, and building up the trade which they had supposed the peace would put into their hands, the English found themselves surrounded by a treacherous and wily foe, from whom existence itself was to be wrested only by perpetual victories. One of these campaigns, pushed into the heart of the enemy's country and crushing, for the time, the spirit of the savages, is the subject of the pages which form the nucleus of this volume, and is detailed in terms as concise and clear and fascinating as those of *Cæsar's Commentaries*, while the charm from the interest of the story is enhanced by a style old enough to embody quaint phrases and turns of thought, but not old enough to be archaic. So that, while the antiquarian or historian will get most out of the book, the average reader will find in it no small pleasure along with the side light it throws upon the events of a period of which popular ideas are vague and undefined.

*Chanticleer: a Thanksgiving Story. By Cornelius Mathews. New York: The American News Co. 1868.*—That a period which—apart from its higher purposes—is consecrated to good eating and drinking should be likewise celebrated by an appropriate literary offering, is a very happy idea, which Mr. Mathews has pleasantly carried out. Our

yearly festival of Thanksgiving is connected with all those cherished recollections of youth which neither grow dim with age nor become obliterated by the ceaseless turmoil of this anxious life. It serves to recall the home of early days, the faces and haunts and cheerful gatherings of childhood; the friends and relatives who sat around the festive board in bygone times, whose memory is held in affectionate reverence now. *Chanticleer* is not exactly what may be called a child's book, and yet it is intended to appeal to the hearts of the young; to teach a lesson which shall penetrate deeply, and make a lasting impression; to enlist their sympathies in the cause of truth and justice, and to lead them, by identifying themselves with the personages of the story, to make a suitable application. The characters in this interesting little narrative are all evidently drawn from nature, and faithfully portray a class in New England which has existed since its early settlement, and which we trust may be fairly represented for many long years to come. With all due respect, however, to the elders of the house, we must—on this occasion—acknowledge that our highest admiration is claimed for that one whose portrait graces the beginning of the volume, and to whose acquaintance we heartily commend the reader.

*The History of the New School, and of the Questions involved in the Disruption of the Presbyterian Church in 1838. By Samuel J. Baird, D.D. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 1868.*—Dr. Baird, now of Staunton, Va., is one of the recognized exponents and advocates of Presbyterian theology and polity, in the sense of the Old School. He is the author of a valuable digest of the acts and deliverances of the Presbyterian Church, and of a dogmatic work with the title *Elohim Revealed*, in which he discussed at length the question of the imputation of sin in opposition to the theory prevailing at Princeton. But though he freely dissents from many Old School writers on the subject of sin, he does not like to have the New School differ from him on points which he considers necessary and vital. The object of his new volume is to prevent a union of the Old and New School Presbyterians, by showing that there is an irreconcilable difference between them on several important heads of doctrine. He insists upon the most literal interpretation of the doctrinal standards of the Church, and will allow of no variations. He also claims that the original "Adopting Act"—the act by which, in 1729, the Westminster Confession and Catechism were adopted as expressing the faith of the Church—is to be interpreted in this exclusive sense, although that act expressly provides for liberty on articles not deemed "essential or necessary." And beside, it strikes us that for any church to claim not only that its ministry shall all receive certain standards, but also an exclusive interpretation of them, as given by one school, is to make a demand which is at once un-Protestant, unwise, and impracticable. It seems to run counter to, or to supersede, the Protestant principle, that the Bible is the only infallible rule of faith and life. Dr. Baird has industriously collected many documents and facts bearing on the history and divisions of the Presbyterian Church, especially upon the rise and growth of the New School theology. But it is, after all, a history of the New School written by a determined opponent, and ascribing to them views, principles, and aims which they have often repudiated. It is always difficult for a polemic and opponent to write a candid history of those with whom he is at war. Those whom Baxter calls "word warriors" are hard to be conciliated. If all the Old School are like Dr. Baird, and all the New School are as he represents them, they ought not to reunite; for reunion would mean perpetual conflict. But we believe that a better spirit is animating the great body of ministers and laymen in both these churches—a spirit of mutual confidence which will make reunion certain and harmonious and successful. It is time for the good of our common Christianity, and in view of the great work before the Christian Church, that these feuds of the schools should come to an end. There must be a higher faith and a larger charity if the church of Christ is to prevail against its foes and to complete its appointed work.

*The Primitive Eirenicon; or Evangelical Ministry. Apostolical Succession Doctrinal, not Tactful, nor exclusively Episcopal. By Rev. Mason Gallaher, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Paterson, N. J. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1868.*—The reverend author, a minister of the Episcopal communion of the Low Church type, and of evangelical sympathies, derives an argument against the High Church claims about an apostolic succession from the undoubted practice of the Patriarchal Church of Alexandria, whose bishops for two hundred and fifty years after the time of the apostles were ordained by presbyters and not by other bishops. He also shows that for more than a hundred years after the English Reformation, down to the times of Charles II., the Church of England recognized the ordination of the non-episcopal churches of the Continent, and freely received their ministers without reordination. This was done of set purpose, with full conviction, and partly by an appeal to the practice in the patriarchate of Alexandria. The early English reformers, Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, and the like, held that the episcopal succession was needful to the well-being, but not to the being, of a church. This is also the position of the author of this clear and able summary of the facts in the case. He has collected, with great industry, a catena of some of the highest Anglican authorities, down to the present time, in support of his case. Even Hooker says, "There may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a

bishop." Bishop Hopkins, of this country, is quoted as holding that "Episcopacy is not necessary to the being, but only to the well-being, of the church." This is also the ground of "Archbishops Whitgift, Parker, Grindal, Cranmer, Usher, Wake, Syngé, Secker, and Howley; also of Bishops Hall, Andrewes, Tomline, and Bloomfield, with Hooker and Bacon."

*The Unnoticed Things of Scripture. By the Rt. Rev. Wm. Ingraham Kip, D.D., Bishop of California. San Francisco and New York: A. Roman & Co. 1868.*—Bishop Kip is well known by his popular and useful works on *The Catacombs of Rome, The Early Jesuit Missions in North America, The Lenten Fast*, etc. In this new volume, which is published in the best style, he brings to light, in a clear and often eloquent manner, several of the "unnoticed things" of Scripture, to which the careless reader needs to have his attention drawn. Some of these are striking and beautiful, and cast new light upon the sacred page. The change in the meaning of many of the words used in the English version is frequently noted. The comments are generally concise and to the point, and written in an attractive style. It is a book that will be edifying to almost any reader. With some of the author's incidental opinions—for example, that Hebrew was the original language of the race—we cannot concur, for lack of evidence.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

- F. J. HUNTINGTON & Co., New York.—Mohun; or, The Last Days of Lee and his Paladins. By John Estlin Cooke. Pp. 309. 1866.  
D. & J. SADLER & Co., New York, Montreal, and Boston.—Valentine McClutchy, the Irish Agent; or, The Chronicles of Castle Cumber. By William Carlton. Pp. v., 408. 1868.  
WILCOX & ROCKWELL, New York.—The Southern Amaranth. Edited by Miss Sallie A. Brock. Pp. xii, 648. 1869.  
JOHN L. SHOREY, Boston.—The Nursery Series of Stories and Pictures: The Sick Doll, and Other Stories; for Youngest Readers. Pp. iv., 192.  
The Child's Auction, and Other Stories; for Youngest Readers. Pp. iv., 188.  
The Great Secret, and Other Stories; for Youngest Readers. Pp. iv., 188. 1869.  
NICHOLS & NOYES, Boston.—The Cricket's Friends. Tales Told by the Cricket, Tea-pot, and Saucepan. By Cousin Virginia. Pp. 219. 1868.  
The Captured Scout of the Army of the James: A Sketch of the Life of Sergeant Henry H. Manning. By Chaplain H. Clay Trumbull. Pp. 60. 1869.  
HURD & HOUGHTON, New York.—A Candid Examination of the Question whether the Pope of Rome is the Great Anti-Christ of Scripture. By the Rt. Rev. John Henry Hopkins, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Vermont. Pp. ix., 150. 1868.  
D. APPLETON & Co., New York.—The Waverley Novels. By Sir Walter Scott, Bart. Waverley; Guy Mannering; Kenilworth; Ivanhoe. Illustrated with steel and wood engravings. Pp. 204, 182, 192, 108. 1868.  
The Poetical Writings of Fitz Greene Halleck. With extracts from those of Joseph Rodman Drake. Edited by James Grant Wilson. Pp. xvii., 389. 1869.  
The Poetical Works of John Dryden. Pp. xx., 524. 1868.  
G. W. CARLETON, New York.—The Arts of Writing, Reading, and Speaking. By Edward W. Cox. Pp. viii., 320. 1868.  
LEVY & HOLT, New York.—The Annals of Rural Bengal. By W. W. Hunter, B.A., M.R.A.S. Second Edition. Pp. xiv., 475. 1868.  
Landmarks of History. By Miss Yonge. Vol. I. Ancient History. Pp. viii., 223. Vol. II. Medieval History. Pp. iv., 252. Vol. III. Modern History. Pp. viii., 478. 1868.  
Beginner's French Reader. Arranged by L. Pylodet. Pp. 225. 1869.  
Beginning German. By Dr. Emil Otto. Arranged by the same. Pp. 172, 37. 1869.  
New Guide to German Conversation. Arranged by the same. Pp. 234, 37. 1869.

## PAMPHLETS.

- LEVY & HOLT, New York; Leipzig: BERNHARD TAUCHNITZ.—Collection of German Authors. Tauchnitz Edition: On the Heights. By B. Auerbach. In 3 vols. 1868.  
CASSELL, PETER, & GALPIN, New York.—The Child's Bible. Illustrated. Part I.  
A. WINCH, Philadelphia.—Exit Caliban and Shylock.  
We have received an Inaugural Address Introductory to the Course of Institutes of Medicine in the Jefferson Medical College, by J. Aitken Meigs, M.D.  
We have also received current numbers of *The Student and Intellectual Observer*, *The People's Magazine*—London; *Demorest's Illustrated Monthly*, *The Christian Examiner*, *The Church Monthly*, *Putnam's Monthly Magazine*—New York; *The American Journal of Horticulture*, *Our Young Folks*, *The Atlantic Monthly*—Boston; *The Humboldt Medical Archives*—St. Louis, Mo.; *The Phonographic Magazine*—New Orleans; *Michigan University Magazine*—Ann Arbor, Mich.

## MUSICAL AND DRAMATIC.

## PROFESSOR RAYMOND'S ELOCUTION.

A COURSE of Shakespearian readings by Mr. Raymond, at the Theatre of the Union League Club, has been somewhat elaborately announced in the newspapers, and those announcements were accompanied by high eulogiums, in advance, on the gentleman's elocutionary powers. *The Evening Post*, especially, assured its readers that Mr. Raymond is one of the few (if, indeed, there is any other) who totally discards the extravagances of actors and professional readers, and comes down to the plain, simple utterances of real life.

Those persons who heard Mr. Raymond read the *MERCHANT OF VENICE* did not find these encomiums justified. His mentioning the name of the play, and his few remarks preliminary to the reading, were given in a quiet, natural, gentlemanly style—though why he followed the absurd custom of reading in full the page devoted to the *dramatis personæ* is not obvious. But the moment he began to utter the language of the *dramatis personæ*, he stepped at once into the sonorous, sepulchral, formal, drawing, mouthing, and, as one may say, "impossible" style of his illustrious predecessors in public dramatic reading. "There is something in this more than natural," says my lord Hamlet; and Hamlet says some other things, commencing "Speak the speech, I pray you, as I pronounced it to you," the meaning, point, and application of which professional readers and actors seem incapable of discovering.

Another fault of Mr. Raymond as a dramatic reader is



his incessant laughing. He begins, or interrupts, or concludes scores of speeches with a short laugh—apparently fearing that, otherwise, his auditors would not fully appreciate Shakespeare's wit; and that, too, in passages where Shakespeare had no thought of being witty. That, also, is the fault of many readers and actors. Moreover, he often drops his voice to a very low tone at the end of a sentence, which is a common fault with all public readers and speakers off the stage. In short, as a mere elocutionist, Mr. Raymond made an absolute and utter failure on this occasion, always excepting the few sentences of his own in reference to the play. They were unexceptionably delivered.

But dramatic reading is a very different thing from elocutionary practice on, or in, plain prose. It involves more or less of the delineation of passion, and it comes within the province of acting, properly so called. The art of the actor stands and ranks far above the art of the mere elocutionist; and whoever undertakes a public display of that art must be held to its higher duties and requirements.

In comic scenes Mr. Raymond shows himself to be an actor of merit. His rendering of Launcelot was very good. It was really artistic, in the popular sense of that word. But whenever he approached anything of high-wrought passion—or even of sentiment or of serious mood—he failed entirely. Such things are beyond his grasp. His failure in Antonio, Bassanio, etc., was just as decided, though of course not so offensive, as in Portia and Shylock. They were, in his hands, nonentities. They were not human beings. No man or woman, in real life, ever uttered his or her own words in such a style as he uttered them. Sometimes sepulchral, sometimes soft and babyish; now high, now low; often whispered, often roared; his tones were as various as one could imagine anything to be, but never appropriate to the character or the situation. The single aside of Portia in the court-room,

"Your wife would give you little thanks for that,  
If she were by to hear you make the offer,"

was the only exception to this universal blundering. That passage was admirably rendered. It was just perfect.

Now, for example, Bassanio to Portia:

"Gentle lady,  
When I did first impart my love to you,  
I freely told you, all the wealth I had  
Ran in my veins," etc.

Why, if the real Bassanio had made that speech to the real Portia as Mr. Raymond made it, the heiress of Belmont would inevitably have given him "a ticket of leave" on the spot. She could not have done less.

Portia received no better treatment. To pass by her terribly mangled speeches to Bassanio, which were quite as bad as his to her, and to dwell for a moment on the speech in the court—Mr. Raymond gave the "lie direct" to the disguised Doctor of Laws. He strained the quality of mercy past all endurance. Very few people have ever heard that speech well delivered on the stage—still fewer have heard it decently rendered elsewhere; but of all the drawing, whining, mumbling, whispering, and fantastically grotesque dramatic orations, commend us to Mr. Raymond's dissertation on "mercy." It was unmerciful.

As for Shylock—alack and alas! why would and why did Mr. Raymond undertake such a thing? Hamlet says that his uncle was

"no more like my father  
Than I to Hercules."

Yet the uncle was *much* more like his father than Mr. Raymond to Shylock. To say that his personation of the Jew was a mere caricature, would be saying nothing. It was not even a caricature. It bore no resemblance whatever to the original.

As to small matters, Mr. Raymond's pronunciation of "devil" and "bond"—

Jessica—"A merry devil,"—and  
Shylock—"Tis not in the bond."

was "dev-el" and "ba-a-and;" for which authority is wanting. And some of his readings were incorrect. He said,

"Who bid thee call? I did not bid thee call."

that is, he emphasized "thee" in both cases. Again, he made Gratiano say,

"Now, Infidel, I have thee on the hip."

And again, Portia,

"The law has yet another hold on you;"

and, *per contra*, he did *not* emphasize "thrice" in this line,

"Pay the bond *thrice* and let the Christian go."

And he erred in the same way in

"Shylock, there's *thrice* thy money," etc.

Mr. Raymond also blundered in the speech of Gratiano—

"O, be thou damned, inexorable dog," etc.—

by *not* delivering it in a boisterous tone, though in many passages he was altogether too boisterous. Shylock's reply to that speech should teach Mr. Raymond how to render it; he says:

"Till thou canst rail the seal from off my bond,  
Thou hast offend'ed thy lungs to *speech so loud*."

The reading of Bellario's letter seemed to *take* with the audience, because it was hurried over after the manner in which our clerks of court read everything; but it was a blunder, nevertheless. The clerk, in this case, is Nerissa, disguised, and her two preceding speeches were spoken by

Mr. Raymond *à la Nerissa*: of course the letter should have been read in the same manner.

As Mr. Raymond is a teacher of elocution, his public rendering of the language of Shakespeare must be taken as his model and method in teaching, and, as such, it calls for reprobation. If he would limit his public exhibitions to merely elocutionary developments, apart from the developments of the higher art of acting, he would no doubt deserve and receive much commendation. But public journalists are recreant to their duty if, instead of censuring the "stagy" performances of dramatic readers, they hold them up as models to be imitated by means of praising, puffing, and applauding them.

### TABLE-TALK.

**WOMAN'S SUFFRAGE** is a question which, here at least and, we fancy, in England, must very soon be treated as other than a matter for theorizing or visionary speculation. Before these lines have reached most of our readers there will have been held at Boston a convention, called by men eminent in literature, in politics, in law, in divinity, and by women scarcely less known or admired—among the signers are such names as James Freeman Clarke, Rev. J. M. Manning, Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, Col. T. W. Higginson, Judge Henry Chapin of Worcester, Professor Child of Cambridge, A. Bronson Alcott, Mrs. Louisa Alcott and Mrs. R. W. Emerson of Concord, Seth Hunt and Samuel Hill of Northampton, Samuel E. Sewall, Mrs. Horace Mann, Mrs. C. M. Severance, F. W. Bird, George F. Hoar, Mrs. Edward Earle, J. R. Bartlett (secretary of state of Rhode Island), Rowland G. Hazard, Miss Wilhelmine Swett, Mrs. George R. Russell, John Neal of Portland—who state the object of the association they intend to form to be "for the wise, systematic, and efficient advocacy of woman's suffrage, and its kindred civil and political rights." We need scarcely say that under such auspices the "woman question" will have a different reception at the hands of the public from that which its associations—not its intrinsic merits—have procured it for these many years back. Nor is it at all necessary for us to say that none can have less sympathy than we have with the proscription under which women have been repressed for ages, or be more desirous of extending to them perfectly fair and just, even generous, treatment, politically and socially. Yet there is this practical question which we desire to urge upon the advocates of woman's emancipation: Can women derive from the possession of the ballot any good great enough to compensate for the consequent *proportional* increase in the ignorant voters who already endanger the stability of republican government? Theory is one thing—the practical working is another and very different one. The proportion of competent voters among women can scarcely be claimed to be greater than among men; indeed we think that, by allowing for their different habits of life and prevalent distaste for politics and ignorance of them, it would have to be acknowledged that the proportion is smaller. But, allowing it to be the same, what proportion of the proposed new voters could be relied upon as desirable persons to have a voice in the direction of public affairs? Deduct the female half of those social strata whose male representatives have made the municipal government of New York, for instance, what it is,—deduct the dolls and fools who never experience the sensation of an idea and do not know how to think,—deduct the mildly developed women who would vote as their husbands or fathers or brothers or gentlemen friends did,—deduct the women busied in home cares or incapacitated by feeble health, whose numbers are greatest among the best social classes,—and we shall find that, we know not what proportion, possibly 2 to 5 in each 100 of the new electors would be such as could really be welcomed as an accession to the voting body. Remember also that, while many of the women we should be content to see vote would for one reason or another habitually fail to do so, the slums and purlieus and back alleys would leave not a feminine ballot unpollled. The women who are engaged in the movement are, *ipso facto*, intelligent: by a very large majority we believe they are patriotic—can they really desire, either for the gratification of their vanity or sense of power, or for the presumed protection of their own interests, that new burdens of imbecility and pollution should be imposed upon the fabric of our government, already strained to the extreme point of endurance?

**WILLIAMS COLLEGE** has got into a very pretty quarrel, whereby the institution is apparently in a state of suspended animation, and the way for extrication from the existing dead-lock is not clearly discernible. The original provocation came from the faculty, who enacted some onerous and insulting laws, which might or might not have been oppressive in their actual enforcement, but which were conceived in a spirit of autocracy that their framers did not attempt to veil. Then the students, instead of meeting the encroachment with firmness and dignity, passed resolutions in which puerility and churlishness were strangely blended, calling for the abrogation of the laws in terms so offensively blunt that it was really impossible for the faculty to recede with self-respect. Originally the students had decidedly the vantage ground, and public sympathy would have been with them in any proper measures for withstanding the meddle-and-muddle policy to which college authorities are, almost with-

out exception, addicted. As *tis*, they have done their best to put the provokers of the feud into the attitude of the injured party, and, in their mode of resenting the treatment of boys, have shown that such treatment is precisely what they need.

**GEN. JOHN MEREDITH READ**—with the assistance of Mr. Thornton, the English Minister, Messrs. Charles and Herman Merivale, and Mr. J. A. Froude—have called the attention of the English government to the historical treasures which exist in the documentary stores of the Russia Company, which now, it is hoped, may be edited and published. This company, originally founded by Sebastian Cabot, in 1555, to establish commercial and diplomatic intercourse between Russia and England, was bound, as a return for certain trade monopolies, to take the care and charges of Russian embassies, by which means, among others, state papers and MSS. of various kinds accumulated in its possession, whose historical value is supposed to be very great.

**MORMONISM** is trying a strange expedient for excluding Gentile light and consequent perversion. This is nothing less ambitious than the invention of a new alphabet. There have recently been delivered at Salt Lake City 10,000 copies of certain school-books printed in the new language. A more ludicrously futile device could scarcely be fancied.

**ROSICRUCIANS** would scarcely be supposed numerous enough in America to require a newspaper organ. Nevertheless there has been commenced the publication, at Rochester, as the "official journal" of the Society of the Rosy Cross—why will the brotherhood perpetuate the delusive derivation?—of *The Illuminati*. This is a well written and well printed monthly octavo, whose purpose is the diffusion of *Light*, meaning thereby "that knowledge which renders crime and meanness unprofitable, prostitution and slavery impossible."

THAT most childish and fluffy of suburban prints, *The Brooklyn Union*, cries with pleasure because patted on the back by its ridiculous namesake, *The Church Union*. Approval from Sir Hubert Stanley with a vengeance! There is certainly a similarity of tone and culture—between these delectable sheets which accounts for their slobbering sympathy; and, what with their mixing up the City of Churches and the union of churches, their jack-knife and wooden-nutmeg flavor, their curious "editorials" which read like the productions of evangelical young buttermen and greengrocers, and their common puffery of sensual and sensation preachers, either might readily be mistaken for the other. It is, perhaps, not surprising that a journal whose cultivated taste is dissatisfied with *The Round Table* should be charmed with *The Brooklyn Union*; but it is both astonishing and funny that the latter paper should be idiotic enough to boast of the fact.

**MESSRS. APPLETON & Co.** have issued their promised edition of *Barnum's Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*, and an important and valuable work it is. It consists substantially of the work of the eminent theologian Dr. William Smith, published in 1860-63; but there are many additions and improvements of a solid character, and the text is illustrated by 500 engravings. The editor, Mr. Barnum, is well known among the graduates of Yale College as an accurate and thorough scholar. His experience in 1845-47 as the principal assistant of the late Prof. Goodrich in the revision of *Webster's Dictionary* (unabridged and royal 8vo editions) made him familiar with the details of lexicography; and his subsequent labors, as an official expounder of the Scriptures, gave him a practical acquaintance with the wants of the people in the field of Biblical knowledge.

**MESSRS. JOHN MURPHY & Co.** announce *John M. Castello; or, The Beauty of Virtue, Exemplified in an American Youth*,—being a memoir of a young man of twenty, of whom the preface informs us that "though subjected to the restraint of rules in some degree austere, he always observed them with irreproachable fidelity, and that in a house where the practice of piety in an eminent degree is aimed at he was looked upon as a model for the most perfect seminarians."

**MESSRS. LITTELL & GAY**—whose *Living Age* will enter upon its hundredth volume with the new year—have commenced the publication in it of *The Country-House on the Rhine*, by Auerbach, the greatest of contemporary German novelists.

**MR. JOHN NEAL**, whose long literary career and large acquaintance with men of letters invest his writings with uncommon interest, has completed an autobiography upon which he has been at work for many years.

**COL. T. W. HIGGINSON** will soon publish a novel called *Malbone*, the name of an artist friend.

**ROBERT COLLEGE**—an American, and we believe Presbyterian, institution at Constantinople—shows in its fifth annual report a decided success. While it has a permanent fund of \$100,000, the income from tuition fees was sufficient to defray all the current expenses, although \$2,500 of these fees was remitted to certain students. The first graduating class consisted of two students, who were examined in Science, Philosophy, Rhetoric, History, and Languages. The unique character of the course in the last particular is exemplified by the fact that the diplomas of the graduates were written in four languages, also that their orations were delivered in Armenian, Bulgarian, and English, while versions had also been prepared in French and Turkish, but there was no time to hear them. Both these gentle-



men—who are pleasingly entitled Gorbanoff and Hogaposs—are to remain in the college as tutors, and one of them has determined to study theology and work as a missionary among the Armenians.

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY has followed the University of London in setting an example to our American colleges which still linger trembling on the brink and fear to launch away. The senate of the University has, without opposition, adopted a report of the examiners, which recommended that examinations in the university studies should be held for women above the age of eighteen. Unless objections are stated in writing, every candidate is to be examined in religious knowledge; the successful candidates are to receive diplomas. The experiment is to be tried for three years.

LADIES have at different times within a few years appropriated most of the articles of men's attire which found grace in their eyes—hats, overcoats, collars, cravats, shirt-bosoms, waistcoats,—to which it is not necessary to add an allusion to their metaphorical aspiration to the breeches. A new annexation, however, is reported by a correspondent at Biarritz. Necessitated, perhaps, by the boot heels, some two inches thick, which are in vogue, walking-sticks have become fashionable, and have even found their way into the hand of the Empress Eugénie. A form particularly popular is said to be a stout white stick, which is at once cane and parasol. It might, we think, by an extension of the fundamental principle, be made still more comprehensive: the cane being hollow, its head might be the bowl of a pipe, which, again, might be transformable into a lorgnette, thus enabling the ladies either to smoke with or to quiz their gentlemen friends, quite after the manner of the latter.

LEIGH HUNT's admirers have succeeded in collecting the sum necessary to the erection of the poet's memorial—a sum which Mr. Childs, of *The Philadelphia Ledger*, asked to be permitted to complete. The design is to be made by Mr. Durham, and to include the line from *Abou ben Adhem*, "Write me as one that loves his fellow-men."

FRANKFORT has been blessed with an interesting literary discovery. The fall of a library shelf holding volumes containing the correspondence of Voltaire and Frederick the Great brought to light certain MSS., yellow and dirty, which turned out to be a series of letters exchanged between Voltaire and Byron. Their authenticity being duly certified, they were forwarded to the Royal Academy of Berlin.

POSITIVISTS, it is said, are about to make a noteworthy effort at propagandism in England. *The Morning Summary*—a daily newspaper newly announced in London, which is to be printed on toned paper and sold for a penny—is declared to be a project of prominent Comtists, who will write under their own names, and doubtless will enforce their peculiar philosophical views.

FRENCHMEN have been remarkably frank of late in acknowledging the supremacy of Germany in certain branches of learning. Particularly noticeable is this confession, quoted by the Paris correspondent of *The Publishers' Circular*:

"Would it not be desirable, in an age when everything is submitted to calculation, to examine this great movement in Germany with the aid of statistics, in other words, to apply numerical analysis to the particular facts which compose it? While waiting for some patient bibliographer to be tempted by this very instructive task, I have for myself collected some figures which I furnish for the curiosity of my readers. Take Pindar, for instance (see Engelmann's *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Classicorum*, Leipzig, 1858)—that poet who is so difficult of comprehension a Letronne was afraid of him. Do you know how often Pindar has been published, translated, commented on in Germany during the last century? Two hundred and fourteen times. I open Gust. Schmidt's *Bibliotheca Philologica* (Göttingen, 1848-57), and I see 1867 produced eighty works (*Erklärungsschriften*) about the Greek and Latin classics. In ten years

(1857-67) one hundred and ninety-seven works on Greek grammar were published in Germany. Now add the collective works to these isolated works; remember there are seven or eight philological reviews, into which, these many years, an army of learned men have poured as into great reservoirs critical notes and dissertations without number, then you may begin to form some idea of the philological movement in Germany. Let us confess this ardent exhumation of antiquity, of which I exhibit only one of the sides, omitting publications relative to literature, to figured monuments, to epigraphy, to the religions and art of paganism—this prodigious activity is humiliating to our national pride. What have we to show? During the last quarter of a century some twenty or thirty grammars, dictionaries, and books of philology; some twenty or thirty editions of texts; some forty translations; a dozen works of criticism and literary history; and some theses—that's all! Does not our indigence appear in this single fact—to publish a new edition in France of a French book, the *Thesaurus Linguae Græcæ*, the publisher did not appeal to French hellenists, but to German hellenists. Historical exactness requires me, however, to say this appeal abroad was made only after M. Boissonade declined the honor of filling so heavy a task."

Yet it is the language of these wonderfully diligent scholars—a language of which to be ignorant involves ignorance of the latest results in almost every branch of modern scholarship and science—that our colleges persist in neglecting,—ignoring it in favor of a smattering of Latin and Greek, small in quantity and wretched in quality.

M. HIPPEAU has been sent by the French Minister of Public Instruction to examine the public school system of the United States.

M. NICOLA SYRIGO has undertaken the publication at Athens, in Modern Greek, of a monthly Catholic review, whose object is the defence of the Roman Church and the restoration to it of the Greek Church.

M. E. DANDIRAU has established at Geneva a curious quarterly called *Théologie et Philosophie*. It is written by Protestants and by rationalists, its profession being to hold the balance fair between the different schools of philosophy and theology, to be "uniquement scientifique," and in its notices of books to present in the most exact manner the views of the authors, *interdicting any expressions of praise or blame*.

ENGINEER-COL. FROLOFF is about to publish—or has published—at St. Petersburg *The Defence of Sevastopol by General Todleben*, a work eagerly anticipated by Russians, and which it would be satisfactory to be able to compare with Mr. Kinglake's accounts. The new volume of the latter, says *The Athenæum*, "after an unusually protracted detention at the hands of the government censors, has at length begun to make its way in the capital."

MR. V. TOMK has translated into Russian from the original Czech the *History of the Czech Supremacy*,—which is to some extent a betterment, we suppose, as the latter language is understood to be particularly repulsive and abominable.

TRANSLATIONS from English into Russian show a diversified taste—here is the fresh list: Buckle's *History of Civilization*, Wilkie Collins's *Moonstone*, and Mr. Dixon's *Spiritual Wives*.

M. FLOTOW is at Paris preparing his new opera, *L'Ombre*, soon to be brought out there. There are but four characters in the story, and no chorus.

M. DE LAMARTINE's condition seems to have changed but for the worse since we last spoke of it. He continues to work, says *Le Nouveau Monde*, but fruitlessly. "Ce qu'il dicte en prose n'est même pas de la prose et n'a plus de sens. Quant à la poésie, il ne se souvient même plus qu'elle existe. Cette décadence morale et physique est navrante pour les amis du poète."

M. TH. JORISSEN, professor of History and Literature at Amsterdam, is soon to publish *Napoleon Ier et la Hollande* (1806-13), *d'après des documents authentiques et inédits*, some of which are said to be essential to an understanding of the political situation of France and the Netherlands during the First Empire.

M. DE BEAUCHESNE is to expand into a *Vie de Madame Elisabeth* an article which he prepared for last month's issue of *La Revue des Questions Historiques*.

M. HENRI HOUSSEY—whose *Histoire d'Apelles* is admired in France—has gone to Athens to prosecute his literary and archaeological studies for the *Histoire d'Alcibiade*, on which he is at work.

MISS EDWARDS, the novelist, we are informed by many contemporary journals, "repudiates the authorship of *The Girl of the Period* articles in *The Saturday Review*." This is very much as if John Stuart Mill or Matthew Arnold were to "repudiate" the authorship of the leading articles in *The Tribune* or *Evening Post*.

MR. EDMUND YATES's new story, *Wrecked in Port*, is to be the leading novel in the new series of *All the Year Round*.

LORD CAMPBELL's *Lives of the Lord Chancellors* is to be completed by the publication of his lives of Lord Lyndhurst and Lord Brougham.

THE REV. A. N. C. MACLACHLAN has prepared for the press Sir Neil Campbell's *Napoleon at Fontainebleau and Elba*, "a journal of occurrences and notes of conversations," to which he adds a memoir of Campbell, who was the British Commissioner.

MR. W. W. HUNTER—whose *Annals of Rural Bengal* has just been published here by Messrs. Leypoldt & Holt—is soon to publish, through Messrs. Trübner & Co., *A Comparative Dictionary of the Non-Aryan Languages of India and High Asia*, which is a lexicon of no fewer than 144 languages, accompanied by prefaces and indices in English, French, German, Russian, and Latin, also political and linguistic dissertations on the aboriginal races.

MISS HARRIET MARTINEAU is to collect in one volume between forty and fifty biographical essays written during the last fifteen years. Among the persons who formed the subjects of the sketches—many of whom Miss Martineau has known personally—are named the Duchess of Gloucester, the Czar Nicholas, the King of Prussia, Prince Metternich, the Duchess of Kent, Lord Herbert, the Earl of Elgin, the Earl of Carlisle, Lord Palmerston, Lord Brougham, Lords Denman, Lyndhurst, and Campbell, Sir W. Napier and Lord Raglan, Humboldt and George Combe, Miss Berry, Lady Byron, Mrs. Opie, Miss Mitford, Charlotte Brontë, Mrs. Marcet, Mrs. Wordsworth, and Mrs. Jameson; Professor Wilson, J. G. Lockhart, S. Rogers, J. W. Croker, Mr. Hallam, De Quincey, Lord Macaulay, and W. S. Landor.

LADY WALLACE has translated Elise Polko's *Reminiscences of Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy*, "an artistic and social biography."

MISS AGNES STRICKLAND has supplemented her voluminous *Lives of the Queens of England* by a volume of *Lives of the Tudor Princesses*, with whom are included Lady Jane Grey and her sisters.

MR. HOMERSHAM COX, the author of several works of Parliamentary history, is soon to publish *Whig and Tory Administrations during the last Thirteen Years*.

PROF. HEINRICH EWALD's *History of Israel* is to have a second edition, in which it will be continued to the time of Samuel.

GEN. CHESNEY, of the Royal Artillery and various learned societies, has completed a *Narrative of the Euphrates Expedition of 1835, '36, '37, and of the Preliminary Survey*.

MAJOR GEORGE CHESNEY, an Indian official, has written *Indian Policy: A View of the System of Administration in India*.

[Mrs. Secretary McCulloch's Report.]

## NO DECLINE IN HOUSEHOLD TREASURES.

Ten years ago I purchased a Wheeler & Wilson Sewing-Machine, and have it in constant use in my family ever since. We used it during the war to make clothing for our volunteers in the service and for the hospitals, and this work was very heavy, being coarse woollen and cotton fabrics. It is still in good working order, nothing having been broken but a few needles.

You are welcome to use my name in your recommendations.

MRS. HUGH McCULLOCH,

Wife of Secretary U. S. Treasury, Washington.

To MESSRS. WHEELER & WILSON.

## HANOVER

### FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

OFFICE: 45 WALL STREET, NEW YORK.

CASH CAPITAL, \$400,000 00  
TOTAL ASSETS, JULY 1, 1868, 614,004 47  
LOSSES PAID SINCE ORGANIZATION, 941,059 30

B. S. WALCOTT, President.

I. Remsen Lane, Secretary.  
Eastern Agency Department, Thomas James, Actuary.  
Western and Southern Agency Department, "Underwriters' Agency."

## CAUTION.

We call attention to the fact that imitations of our fine ELECTRO-PLATE, consisting of Dinner, Dessert, Tea Services, etc., are extensively produced by American manufacturers; also, that there are English imitations in market, both of inferior quality. These goods are offered for sale by many dealers, and are well calculated to deceive. Purchasers can only detect and avoid counterfeits by noting our trade-mark, thus:



Our Goods, which can be obtained from all responsible dealers, bear this stamp. They are heavily plated on the finest Albata or Nickel Silver, and we guarantee them in every respect superior to the best Sheffield Plate.

CORHAM MANUFACTURING CO.,  
Silversmiths and Manufacturers of Fine Electro-Plate, Providence, R. I.

## THE LECTURE SEASON.

Lyceums, Literary Associations, Charitable Societies, etc., should send for the Lecture List of the American Literary Bureau before making up their Programmes.

The Bureau has made special arrangements with some of the best-known Lecturers and Readers in this country, and in England; while it is empowered to negotiate engagements not only with those on its lists, but with many others of high repute, whose names do not appear.

The Circular of the Bureau contains, among others, the following names: Col. T. W. HIGGINSON, Prof. E. L. YOUNG, E. P. WHIFFLE, R. J. DE CORDOVA, P. B. DU CHAILLU, HORACE GREELEY, DR. ISAAC I. HAYES, C. OSCANNAN, HENRY NICHOLS, of London, and OLIVE LOGAN.

For circulars and terms address

THE AMERICAN LITERARY BUREAU,

P. O. Box 6701.

32 Nassau Street, New York.

## AMERICAN

## WALTHAM WATCHES.

Recommended by Railway Conductors, Engineers, and Expressmen, the most exacting class of watch-wearers, as superior to all others for strength, steadiness, accuracy, and durability.

For sale by all respectable dealers.

## WIDDLETON, PUBLISHER,

27 Howard Street, New York.

## THE CALAMITIES AND QUARRELS OF AUTHORS.

With some inquiries respecting their moral and literary characters, and memoirs for our literary history, by

ISAAC DISRAELI.

Edited by his son,

THE RIGHT HON. B. DISRAELI.

2 vols. crown 8vo, cloth, \$3 50; half calf, \$7.

This work completes our edition, the very best in every respect, of the elder Disraeli's works, in nine uniform vols. crown 8vo, large, clear type on toned paper.

COMPRISING:

Curiosities of Literature. 4 vols., \$7.

Amenities of Literature. 2 vols., \$3 50.

Calamities and Quarrels of Authors. 2 vols., \$3 50.

The Literary Character. 1 vol., \$2 25.

Or the complete set, 9 vols., cloth, in case, \$15; half calf, \$30. For sale at the Principal Bookstores, and sent by mail or express on receipt of price by the Publisher.



6 ST. PAUL STREET, Baltimore.